AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. X.—APRIL, 1894.—NO. 4.

THE GRAND INQUISITOR FR. JEAN BREHAL,

ADVOCATE OF THE "VENER. SERVANT OF GOD," JOAN OF ARC.

Jean Bréhal, Grand Inquisiteur de France, et la Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc. Par le R. P. Marie-Joseph Belon, O. P. Prof. de Dogme aux Facultés Cathol. de Lyon, et le R. P. François Balme, O. P. Lect. en Théologie. Paris: P. Lethellieux, Libraire-Editeur, 1893.

IT was through the instrumentality of an unscrupulous and ambitious churchman who sought favor with what was for the time the dominant faction in France, that the saintly and heroic maiden of Domremy was betrayed. The Catholic University of Paris unfortunately seconded the dastardly project, and the innocent victim of domestic intrigues and foreign fanaticism was condemned by an English court and publicly executed on Wednesday, the 30th of May, 1431.

Her death, tragic and beautiful, called forth the sympathy of those who shared her faith and who loved unfortunate France, in defence of whose liberty she had offered her young life; and her martyrdom became at once the seed of a veneration which, after a growth of nearly five centuries, bears in her reception of the title "Venerabilis" the first fair flower of the crown which we may hope will deck the chaste brow of a saint.

Few historians have dared to doubt the injustice of the judgment which pronounced her guilty, and which by its very malice has furnished those striking shadows which

render the golden lustre of her lovely image a lasting triumph. The old records show that even those who had a hand in the work deeply regretted it on seeing it done.[1] As early as 1450 Charles VII, after regaining possession of Paris and Rouen, ordered a revision of the odious process by which the Maid of Orleans had been condemned. The person chosen to conduct the inquest was one William Bouillé, who stood apparently well with all parties, not excluding the University, of which he had been rector in 1439. The examinations would have undoubtedly led to an utter and immediate reversal of all the charges brought against Joanna, if the influence of the English Government, seconded once more by the misrepresentations of the University authorities, had not delayed decided progress of the affair in Rome. The Sovereign Pontiff, Nicholas V, was, moreover, anxious at the time to effect a union between England and France in order to secure Italy against Mussulmanic aggression, a fact which advised a careful avoidance just then of fresh animosities, however much the Pope might have been convinced of the justice of Joanna's cause. Nevertheless, this very caution turned in the end to the benefit of the measure. Nicholas V sent as mediator between the two nations the Cardinal d'Estouteville, a man whose father being of noble Norman blood, whilst his mother was related to Charles VII, was likely to succeed in the difficult mission. But Cardinal d'Estouteville had much more in mind and at heart than to conciliate the Kings, and in his capacity as Papal Legate turned out not only to be a reformer of the modes and teachings of the University, but also a most ardent champion of the cause of Jeanne d'Arc. He had arrived in Lyons on the 14th of December, 1451, before the Bishops of Clermont and Tulle, who had been deputed by the King to meet the Apostolic Delegate, found time to arrive. In the following February we meet him at Tours negotiating with

1 Immediately after the death of the saintly Jeanne d'Arc the executioner came to Friar Isambard de la Pierre, who had assisted and consoled her frequently during the trial, and bitterly deplored his participation in the act, since at heart he believed her to have been wholly innocent and a saint.

Charles VII, who held court there at the time. Toward the end of April, having won the complete confidence of the King, he started for Rouen, and here, in his capacity of representative of the Pope, at once opened in regular canonical form the process of revising the trial of Jeanne d'Arc. According to the proctocol, which gives us the authentic account of the preparatory inquiry into the case, the Delegate did not invite or await any formal accusation or denunciation which would lodge the responsibility of his action upon some plaintiff. He justly claimed the right of canonical investigation on the patent ground that there was a general rumor of an injustice done of which the legate had received cognizance in various ways and at different times. The canonical law revised by Boniface VIII required that in such trials the service of a regular member of the "Inquisition" be employed aside of the usual canonists and jurisconsults. The Cardinal accordingly chose the learned and zealous Jean Bréhal, to whose uninterrupted activity during four years we owe the collation of documentary evidence so complete and decisive as not only to vindicate the innocence of the holy maiden, but to serve as the immediate occasion for establishing the glory of Catholic France in promising to secure the crown of sanctity for one of her daughters who, by the sacrifice of her life, sought to establish her country's safety and honor.

Much might be said of the meaning to be read in the present action of the Church consecrating with the seal of sanctity the virtue of an unstained patriotism and of that heroic womanhood which rises above the ordinary sphere of action by the immediate call of God. But we wish here to call attention rather to the man, hardly known or remembered until very recently, who chiefly aided by his labors in the accomplishment of the glory, which every loyal child of France and every true member of the Catholic Church is glad to see accorded to the "Venerable" Joanna, lovely representative of chivalrous and pure womanhood, who is expected soon to earn the highest title of nobility in being enrolled in the Album of Saints.

Withal, our sketch must necessarily be scant in details.

What we know of the great soul who devoted himself to the work of re-establishing the tarnished fame of our saintly heroine, must be gathered from the work of PP. Belon and Balme before us. These writers in turn rely upon Echard's account, in his *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*,[1] and the Dominican Chapotin's *Études Historiques sur la Province Dominicaine de France*. But apart from the interest which attaches to the person of the Inquisitor, our brief study will show that the Inquisition, which is in most minds associated with judicial proceedings having for their object the laying bare of crime, had another and nobler purpose, namely, that of vindicating right and virtue. If we measure the actual work of the Inquisition as an institute of judicial and ecclesiastical reform, it will be found that, just as in the case of the Venerable Joanna, the good done by the re-establishment of justice and the defense of the innocent far outbalances the errors committed in its name by some of the Church's professed representatives who in acting with injustice or cruelty invariably transgressed the declared purpose and limits which the Inquisition as a disciplinary court of the Church possessed and sanctioned.

Friar Jean Bréhal hailed from Normandy. The exact year of his birth is not known (probably about 1406) nor can it be said with certainty that he was a native of Evreux, where we first meet him in the school of the Dominicans making the seven years' course of studies—two in *Studium artium*, two more in *Studium naturalium*, and three in *Studium theologicum*, followed by four years in the exercise of teaching, as laid down in the traditional programme of academic promotion in the Order.

It was to be expected that at the end of his studies the young Dominican would be sent to the Paris University in order to pass there his regular examination for the Doctorate. This was the usual way. It appears, however, that about the time of his ordination, the University of Caen, which had just been established and endowed by Henry VI with a

1 Quétif et Echard, Tom. I, p. 815.

faculty *utriusque juris* and shortly after possessed additional chairs for the arts and for theology, had obtained a decree forbidding students of the province to go to Paris. Whether the fact that Charles VII had made a gift of the city of Evreux to John Stuart, Earl of Darnley, had anything to do with this prohibition we cannot say, but it appears that Father Jean Bréhal, after finishing his term of *Bachelier* in professing the *studium generale* obtained his doctorate by the favor of the municipal authorities of Evreux. In the archives of the town-hall of that city the following quaint entry is made in the year 1443:—"A religieuse personne et honneste maistre Jehan Bréhal, docteur en théologie, pour don à luy fait par les gens d'église et bourgois d'icelle ville, pour aider à supporter les frais et mises qui lui convinrent fére quand il fut ordonné et fait docteur, pour ce paié par le commendement et ordonnance diceulx gens d'église et bourgois la somme de dix salus d'or, pour ce IX l."[1]

The fact that soon after we find him engaged in the important position of superior of a house of his Order in Paris, and his appointment there by the Holy See as Inquisitor General of France gives ample testimony to the high order of his moral and intellectual acquirements. He could hardly have passed much beyond the requisite age for so responsible an office as that of Inquisitor, to which none who had not attained his fortieth year was eligible, whatever his reputation for ability might be in other respects. The qualifications demanded for the office of Inquisitor are summed up by Pope Urban IV in his bull *Prae cunctis.*[2] The candidate must possess the highest reputation for blameless morality, that is to say, he is not only to be free from all imputations against his

1 Préludes du procès, pag. 10, not. 3.

2 "Providimus igitur ibidem ad praesens personas aliquas circumspectas pro tanto negotio deputari, quarum honesta conversatio exemplum tribuat puritatis (pietatis?), et doctrinam fundant labia salutarem, ut sacro ipsarum ministerio praefatae partes ab hujusmodi contagiis expurgentur. Quatenus in charitate Dei hominum timore postposito, virtutem spiritus induentes ex alto, praedictum officium, etc." 28 Jul., 1261. *Eymeric. Direct Inquisit.*

honor, but to be universally recognized as endowed with noble character and virtuous qualities; he is to possess prudence in an eminent degree; to be of unshaken firmness in maintaining the right, gifted with a habit of generous charity so as to direct his zeal for the good of all, and of a mind equipped with wisdom and knowledge.

Bernardus Gui, in his "Practica Inquisitionis," has drawn out at greater length the qualities of mind and heart which should adorn a member of the Inquisition. It is a noble picture, the details of which it would occupy us too long here to describe; suffice it to say that the office demands a rare combination of such virtues as make princes who sit in judgment beloved by the best portion of their people and honored by those who have no heart for gratitude. The biographer of Jean Bréhal gives ample illustration to show that the young Prior of the Paris Community possessed these gifts in a high degree. They were indeed called forth on more than one occasion when a less sagacious and less courageous temper than that of Bréhal would have despaired of the cause of right.

Students of history are familiar with the extraordinary influence exercised by the University of Paris about the time of which we speak. Unfortunately the authorities of this potent intellectual centre failed at times to use their prestige in the right direction. Apart from the jealousy with which they regarded the success of the mendicant Orders whose disciples had succeeded in combining their efforts in the domain of letters, there were certain privileges of which the Paris University, as the oldest public teaching corporation in Europe claimed exclusive possession. Now and then the Popes granted to the Religious Orders exemptions and rights of a nature to diminish that autocracy in settling controversies and conferring degrees to which the University had laid exclusive or undisputed claim. On one occasion the Regents of the University solemnly interdicted the publication of one of these privileges by the Dominicans, declaring the document spurious and citing the Friars before the academic tribunal. Prior Jean Bréhal on this occasion assumed the

defence of not only his own Order but of all the religious Communities in France which had suffered from the arrogant assumptions of the University. Instead of presenting himself, however, as a defendant against an unfounded charge, he stated the privileges and rights granted the Orders by the Holy See, and in a dignified and calm manner demanded a full and open recognition of these in the name of the Pope. He pointed out that the Dominicans together with the other mendicant Orders had rendered singular service to their country in the cause of letters. If they claimed the exercise of the function which had hitherto been monopolized by the University on the plea of public grant, they did so without encroachment upon the right of the University and they did not expect or ask its sanction. He referred them to Rome and in the meantime gave to understand that he meant to maintain the privileges of the Order as a teaching faculty. The Paris authorities were astonished at the position taken by the comparatively young Prior. They treated it as an insult to their illustrious body. He had moreover, spoken in French, instead of using, according to academic custom, the Latin, which seemed to indicate a sort of contempt of their learned prerogatives. But Bréhal remained unmoved; he had gained his principal point in making them understand that they had to deal with a man who was fully aware of the justice of his pretensions. Through the intervention of the Augustinian Prior, who was presented to speak for his Order, a compromise was for a time effected by recognizing some of the academic rights of the Mendicants. Several months later complete recognition was granted to the Dominicans.

Bréhal had on another occasion emphasized his determination not to be swayed by human considerations in the exercise of his functions as Inquisitor General of France. One of the Professors of the University had publicly taught and sustained certain erroneous propositions on points of Catholic doctrine. Bréhal promptly cited him before his tribunal to answer for his conduct. The entire University rose up in arms against such an act, but our Inquisitor, whilst

expressing himself quite prepared to have the matter concluded in an amicable way and to recognize the position of the University as a *magisterium* of theology in France, insisted with iron determination that the norm of Catholic doctrine was decided not by the Paris University but by the Holy See and that the right to teach emanated from the Head of the Church by whom the Inquisition had been instituted to check the vagaries of individual teachers. Of that Inquisition he (Bréhal) was the rightful representative, a position which did not allow him to make distinctions between university professors and others who might propagate error under the name and prestige of the Catholic religion.

In the preface of an erudite work which Bréhal wrote in order to refute a false doctrine regarding sacramental jurisdiction which had been advanced by some secular professors imbued with the principles of William de Saint-Amour, the author is styled *vigilantissimus inquisitor* by the superior who procures the edition. He himself gives evidence of the spirit which animated him throughout the composition of the book held in high estimation as a solid, temperate and learned defence of the Catholic teaching on the subject which it treats. "I have consulted," he says in the concluding chapter, "to the best of my humble capacity, the interests of truth, set forth, with all sobriety and charity; and in doing so I have kept ever before me as my light and truest model that sole infallible rule, Him, who is the Way and the Truth and the Light. May He be blessed for ever and ever. Amen." Malbrancq (de Morinis) mentions a work from the pen of Bréhal regarding the origin of some monastic institutions, although the MS. is not known to exist.

But what most concerns us here is Jean Bréhal's activity as Inquisitor in the affairs relating to the trial and condemnation of the Venerable Jeanne d'Arc. Independently of his official capacity as Chief of the Inquisition in France, which charge he held until the end of 1474, when Jean Watat, of the convent of Châlons succeeded him, there could hardly have been found in France a man more according to the heart of

Cardinal d'Estouteville and one more zealous and successful in vindicating the honor of France and the Church by placing the case of the martyr heroine in its just light. During the four years, from 1452–1456, he labored incessantly in collecting the evidence which has become the chief and most reliable source of documentary information to be used in the process of canonization now under action at Rome.

We do not propose here to enter into the details of the process, the endless journeys and personal inquests, the lengthy reports made for the benefit of the different civil and religious authorities, together with the attestations of churchmen and officials in various parts of France, Italy and Austria. All these things may be found in the first two books of the work placed at the head of this article. The labor of Jean Bréhal which calls for our special attention is the *Recollectio* written by himself and now published complete, after careful correction, according to the original manuscript, by PP. Belon and Balme. The importance of this document had for a long time been underestimated. It seems that Quicherat, in writing his history of the process, had been influenced by the statement of a doctor of the Sorbonne, Edmund Richer, to the effect that the regests of Bréhal were an erudite but practically worthless collection of dissertations in jurisprudence and theology, called forth by the investigation without shedding much light upon the facts. Others accepted the statement without satisfying themselves of its accuracy until the learned and judicious Marius Sepet corrected the error by placing the worth of Bréhal's summary in its true light. M. Lanery d'Arc in his *Memoires et Consultations en faveur de Jeanne d'Arc*, and last of all, but most effectively, the Jesuit Father Ayroles in his recently published *La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc*, have done full justice to the great Inquisitor and patron of our saintly heroine by citing at length many parts of the *Recollectio* and giving a fair analysis of the entire labor. It is not to be denied that a very large part of the work may be styled a memoire of jurisprudence and theology, withal closely pertinent to the subject of which the process treats; but it is in this that we find established the

true principles upon which serious judgments must be conducted. Beyond this, however, there is an abundance of facts and a care of detail regarding the procedure, in which, to use the words of the late editors of the *Recollectio*, "Bréhal fournit à l'historien des matériaux authentiques—les faits consignés au dossier, contrôlés par consequent avec une rigoureuse exactitude—et une appréciation solidement motivée, dont il est loisible d'éprouver la justesse, mais qu'on peut accepter de prime-abord, au moins sous bénéfice d'inventaire." (Liv. III, p. 100.)

The first nine chapters of the work of Bréhal are taken up with what the author calls the *matter* of the process, in which the previous charges made by the English court are successively analyzed and their solidity tested. The history of these charges is well known from books and review articles. But Bréhal treats them from the juridical and philosophical point of view; he enters into the motive, the psychological aspect of the case, so as to justify the extraordinary position of this maiden, who was evidently compelled to her course of beneficent heroism by some supernatural agency, which no circumstance in her life allows us to doubt was any other than divine.

The second part of the *Recollectio* deals with the *form* of the previous process. It consists of twelve chapters and sets forth in the first place the incompetency of the judge, as represented mainly in the person of an unprincipled bishop, who, without ecclesiastical jurisdiction, having become a renegade to his own land and king, and having offered and received bribes, outraged every sense of justice and honor by the high-handed manner in which he uttered sentence. It is shown how he acted throughout on the testimony of vague rumors and false suspicion, on partial and contradictory evidence, and under traitorous influence, abused his sacred office and employed the name and authority of the Church to gain his personal ends.

In his argument Bréhal proceeds upon strictly scholastic lines. He outlines the scope of a judicial sentence by defining the meaning of the word "judicium," and thence

circumscribes the duty of a judge. "The legality of a judgment has its foundation in the fact that it is an act of justice. In order that a judgment be an act of justice three things principally are required in the person who assumes the right of exercising judgment. First, he must possess authority of jurisdiction or, in other words, the right to preside in the court. Secondly, his action in judgment must rest upon definite and certain evidence, and in estimating it he must follow right reason and prudence. Thirdly, he must be actuated by the motive of doing justice. If any of these three conditions be wanting, the judgment is vitiated and unlawful."[1]

In like manner all the evidence is sifted according to the strict method of the Angelic Doctor which admits of no equivocation, no misuse of terms, no insertion of captions by which the mind of the jury might be prejudiced or the judgment led astray through eloquent sophistry. In many places he uses the very words of St. Thomas and of that master in the art of uncompromising logic, Aristotle. All the shrewdly woven texture which served to veil the truth is torn apart, shred upon shred. Then thread after thread is turned industriously to the full light of the sun, until its dark side uppermost becomes a background for the fair fame of that lovely image, the white flower with ruby crown, representing the maiden saviour of France.[2]

1 Ideoque in tantum judicium est licitum, in quantum est actus justicie. Ut autem judicium sit actus justicie, tria poti-simum requiruntur, in eo scilicet qui assumit exercere judicium. Primum est, quod procedat ex auctoritate jurisdictionis seu presidencie. Secundum est, quod agat et moveatur ex certitudine, et secundum rectam racionem prudencie. Tercium est, quod inducatur ex inclinatione justicie. Unde si quodcumque horum defuerit, judicium utique viciosum erit et illicitum. Texte de la *Recollectio*, cap. 1.

2 The chapters of the second part of the *Recollectio*, the quaint orthography of which we reproduce as in the original, run in the following order: I. De incompetencia judicis, maxime episcopi qui processum deduxit. II. De iudicantis episcopi inordinato et corrupto affectu, ac ejusdem severitate. III De incommoditate carcerum ac custodum ejus. IV. De recusatione judicis, et sufficienti provocatione seu appellacione ad papam. V. De subinquisitore, ac ejus diffugio, et metu sibi illato. VI. De articulorum

We have already mentioned how important the work of P. Bréhal is both from a historical point of view as also in evidence to the argument for canonization now being conducted by the S. Congregation at Rome. It is a plea of unimpeachable candor and strength, so that one is forced to concur with the opinion of the editors expressed in the chapter entitled *Étude critique du Manuscrit*, speaking of the work as "Un travail remarquable par la solidité de sa doctrine théologique et canonique, par la sûreté de ses appréciations et de ses résonnements, par la richesse et l'abondance des citations de toute sorte dont il est émaillé."

The judges, ecclesiastical and civil, of whom the official text mentions eleven, accepted the report in evidence as complete and unquestionable. The former judgment was reversed and the court which had pronounced it was publicly censured. This final act took place on July 7th, 1456. The result was communicated to King Charles at his residence in Bourbonnais, and the joy proclaimed throughout France caused festive celebrations everywhere, particularly at Rouen and Orleans where, as is noted by the historian, Jean Bréhal presided among princes and prelates. The next step to be taken was to inform the venerable pontiff Calixtus III of the result. Had that Pope been free to act amid the political difficulties which pressed upon him for solution,[1] not only in Italy, but throughout the continent and in England, which had failed to improve the chances of her previous conquest, the humble maid of Domremy might have received her crown of canonization ere now. Jean Bréhal and Guillaume Bouillé, who had assisted him all through the process of

falsitate, et corrupta eorum composicione. VII. De qualitate revocacionis seu abjuracionis quam Johanna facere impulsa fuit. VIII. De pretenso relapsu contra Johannam. IX. De interrogantibus, ac difficilibus interrogatoriis Johanne factis. X. De defensoribus de exhortatoribus, deque accessoribus, atque de predicantibus, processui intervenientibus. XI. De deliberantibus in causa, seu determinacionibus eorum quoad capitula causae. XII. De qualitate sentencie et diffinicione processus. Text Recoll.

1 Calixtus had just sent Cardinal Allain de Coëtivy as special legate to the court of Charles VII to solicit the aid of France against the Turk. The Legate was at this time in Avignon. Liv. V, chap. iii, p. 164.

investigation, were commissioned to lay the whole matter before Calixtus. We are only told of the Pontiff's joy at the rehabilitation of her whom the people of France spontaneously honored as a saint.

Jean Bréhal had accomplished what we may justly consider the most important work of his life; but he was obliged to retain the office of Grand Inquisitor for eighteen years more. At length, when he had attained the age of three score and ten, he might have hoped to be permitted to retire to the beloved abode of his earlier years, the convent of Evreux. God wished him to meet there the odium and irregularities against which he had all these years set his face by the vigilant measures of reform which he had undertaken outside of his own community. The spirit of insubordination caused by war and schism, above all by the contentious attitude of the Paris University, which fostered it beyond her own circle, had left its influence upon society and the clergy. Disorders and general laxity had crept into the Religious Orders. Claude Bruno, the Provincial of the Dominicans in France, saw the evil and its destructive progress and determined upon a reform in his own community. To carry out the measures of rigorous discipline which were found necessary for this purpose, he selected Jean Bréhal, whose experience, zeal for the good of religion, and strong yet gentle character pointed him out as a secure reformer. The aged monk accepted the charge as one who knows no higher motive for action than that dictated by obedience in the cause of virtue. He had but few years to live, but that these were spent in energetic and efficient labor for the reform of his Order, is evident from the record of his work preserved in the archives of the community at Rome. The Superior General, Léonard de Mansuetis, had given him letters patent for the full exercise of authority in matters pertaining to the religious reform approved and urged by Rome. Bréhal began, as was to be expected, the restoration of ancient discipline at his own convent of Evreux. A letter dated from Rome, April 1, 1477, confirms all he has done and praises alike his zeal and his prudence. In the following

year (December 5th, 1478) the reform, though gradually introduced, began to show its fruits in the exemplary conduct of the monks of Evreux. The General Chapter of the Order, held in 1479 at Perugia, not only attests in its documents the religious regeneration effected through the care and wisdom of the venerable Bréhal, but set the community of Evreux as an example to be imitated by all the other convents. To guarantee a continuance of this work, Jean Bréhal was appointed Vicar to the Master General, charged in an especial manner to watch over the reforms previously introduced. "Magister Johannes Bréhalli fuit factus vicarius super suo conventu Ebroicensi jam reformato, *cum plenissima potestate ad manutenendam reformacionem*, et maxime communitatem camerarum, terminorum, pecuniarum et aliarum rerum, et potest Priorem absolvere et confirmare, et fratres expellere inutiles, et bonos recipere. Dat. Romæ, 5 dec. 1478." *Archiv. Ord. Romæ: Reg. II Magistri Léon de Mansuetis, fo. 18.*

Such was the man to whose faithful and enlightened industry we owe the testimony which establishes not only the innocence but the heroic sanctity of the Maid of Orleans. That testimony might never have come to us so definite, so unimpeachable and so complete, had the Grand Inquisitor of France been a person of different stamp. There were many witnesses to prove the true character of Jeanne d'Arc, the people as a body were enthusiastic in their veneration of her, the King and the Pope, all believed her to be the victim of foul calumny—yet all this might have been inefficient in a court of canonization, as it would be even in a court of law; for there was powerful opposition not only of individuals but above all of the University which exercised a determined influence in such proceedings. Only the most fearless champion of truth and honor would lay himself open, as Bréhal did, to the vindictive animosity of such forces. "No doubt," says his biographer, "at the approach of his death he rejoiced and felt fortified by the recollection of the labors undertaken in behalf of Jeanne d'Arc. The gratitude of that saintly martyr was assured him, whilst men bless his memory,

because he devoted himself, more than any one else, to the work of restoring her to her rightful place in history[1]." Thanks to these efforts the regret expressed by Delavigne in the last line of his beautiful poem on the death of Jeanne d'Arc will soon, we may hope, be rendered void by her canonization.

Venez, jeunes beautés, venez braves soldates,
Semez sur son tombeau les lauriers et les roses!
Qu'un jour le voyageur, en parcourant ces bois,
Cueille un rameau sacré, l'y dépose et s'écrie:
A celle qui sauva le trône et la patrie,
Et n'obtint qu'un tombeau pour prix de ces exploits!

THE EDITOR.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

THERE was a lecture delivered once in Philadelphia by by Rev. Albert Barnes, a Presbyterian. It was a plea in behalf of the colleges in the West; and, in the course of his remarks, not a few of his reflections bore upon priests, Jesuits and Sisters: "I am not afraid of priests," he cried. "A mere priest, in such a country as this is a poor creature. Let the priest come; and, in the climate of our freedom, with a free pulpit and a free press and free schools, and with the fountains of free and manly thoughts in our seats of higher education, it will be seen that priestcraft is not a thriving business. But deliver us from the Jesuit professor—the Popish teacher—forming the minds, and shaping the entire intellectual and moral character of those who are to direct the opinions of the masses of our people. A Sister of Charity, teaching French and music and such like things, in a nunnery boarding-school, is a mightier agent than a priest with his Latin prayers and his maledictions and his holy water."[2]

1 Liv. I, ch. ii, p. 21.

2 A plea in behalf of Western Colleges; a discourse delivered before the Society for promoting collegiate and theological education in the West, in the First Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J., October 29, 1815; and in the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, February 22, 1846; by Albert Barnes.

To our mind, the most interesting feature of this declamation is the fact that it was delivered half a century ago. At a distance from us longer than the usual span of life, it put forth in 1845 what an Episcopal Bishop, of western New York, might be conceived to say, and in sooth, is actually declaiming in 1894. The solemn warning was rehearsed in the Presbyterian churches of Newark and Philadelphia; and with a correct appreciation of its pregnant eloquence, the board of the society which listened to it, disseminated the gentleman's wisdom from the publishing houses, not only of Philadelphia, but also of New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis.

The pronouncements contained in the address were lugubrious in their tone as to the past, present and future of Protestant education. Yet they were triumphant in their refutation of Catholic pretensions and Catholic assumptions, and emphatic in their disapproval of Catholic success, forty-eight years ago. Speaking of the Sisters and the Jesuits, he said: "If they are to monopolize the higher education of the West; if they are to have the conceded reputation of giving the best education, they win the field. Then where are we as a people? . . . There is no error more prevalent than that of overrating the advantages of Catholic seminaries of learning; and the causes of that error it would not be difficult to state." He makes some statements; and his sense of honesty and truth seems to feel no difficulty at all in making them, nor scruple in pretending to believe them. Then with a supreme effort of rhetoric and logic, he sweeps his own fallacies triumphantly away: "Yet we may ask, and the question will not soon be answered, where in this country is there a Jesuit college that, for purposes of educating the youth of this land for the duties of American citizenship, can be compared with Yale, or Harvard, or Dartmouth, or Princeton? There is not one!"

He winds up his indictment of Catholic excellence in these weighty terms: "Colleges and schools and seminaries for both sexes there will be (in the mighty West); and one thing is clear; unless we can establish institutions of learning that shall be of as high an order of scholarship, and as cheap as

the Jesuits, the issue will not be doubtful. That we *can* do it, no one can doubt; if we *will* do it, the West is safe; our country is safe; the cause of liberty and Protestantism in the world is safe."

Here then it would appear that the cause of higher education was trembling in the balance, half a century ago; and that on a scale of national proportions. Grammar school education was as yet in a state of infancy and innocence. But, as the great mechanism into which it has since been forced rose in all its gaunt proportions, and the proportionately vast parochial school system stood up side by side with it, or face to face, the two seem to have assumed the same mutual relations of comparative excellence, which had marked the attitude of higher education on one side and the other. No doubt, the gift of technical genius has invented a better means of financial supply than taking up voluntary collections in Presbyterian churches; and like all advanced mechanism, the supply valves of a forced taxation work more automatically and less capriciously than the pulses of a free and parental system. Still, while the financial advantages have been all on one side, it would really seem as if the mutual relations in point of respective excellence had not materially changed between the two sides. Let us mention what may be taken as a little illustration.

In the month of December, 1893, we read the following in one of the high-class reviews of the country, a periodical devoted entirely to the pedagogics of the State system: "It is not a pleasant confession to make, but the American teacher cannot write good English; that is, the average teacher cannot. The *Educational Review* receives scores of manuscripts every month, not a few of them written by teachers of more than a merely local reputation, which, if printed, would ruin the reputation of their authors forever . . . Unfortunately, our national shortcoming has been noticed abroad as well as at home. Only a few weeks since, a well-known English critic pointed to two new American books on education—both written by men of prominence—and asked how it was possible that two such atrociously

written books could find a publisher . . . Another eminent authority on the use of words recently sent to the *Educational Review* a list of more than one hundred violations of good usage, all taken from a single school-book written by a man who has made his mark in literature. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*[1]"

The one pleasant feature we note in this unpleasant confession is that neither Sisters nor Jesuits are indicted as responsible for the appalling disaster—this disaster of national decadence—reflecting on past time when the present illustrious victims of illiteracy were seated on the benches at the feet of incompetent teachers, and reaching forward to future time, when the hapless generation now seated under incompetent teachers will radiate an accumulated ignorance, for the benefit of generations to come. *Qualis magister, talis discipulus.* With thanks we record it, that "Popish teachers" are not summoned to the bar for bewitching the world with pedagogical ignorance. Nor indeed were they so indicted by the Rev. Albert Barnes, forty-eight years ago. Then they stood arraigned for precisely the counter-charge of threatening to impound all national excellence in Catholic schools and seminaries. Have they perhaps done so, and that to such a degree of rapacious cruelty, as not to leave a scrap of good English in the rifled pockets of their competitors? English! Hear it! We should have expected algebra, or drawing, or even possibly biology to go first. May be, they are gone into shreds; and English was the last piece supposed to be whole. But it is whole no more; and who shall patch it?

According to the canons of approved polemics, a sacred silence is generally observed with regard to Catholic education. Institutions which are under Catholic management do sometimes figure in statistical tables of incomes, foundations, salaries, and the like. And we must confess our deep confusion at beholding what a nonentity the Church seems to be, when there is question of money, buildings, professor-

1 *Educational Review*, December, 1893, pp. 514–15.

ships! Outside of this little compliment so paid to us, a pall of silence rests over all. And when, as in the late Columbian year, there was no helping it, but Catholic institutions were heard from, and were seen, still the degree of cultivation to which the silence was carried almost equalled that of the pedagogical culture, altogether too conspicuous in the convents and parochial schools. Silence is a fine art in what is called "national" education. And, not to dally too long with introducing what we have to say in this paper, we shall come to the point at once, and make bold to observe the following historical facts, which, like other useful things, are buried in the dead silence of all the pedagogical literature of our time:—

In the first place, what is called national instruction is in a state of decadence, whatever be the country to which we turn our eyes. Secondly, distinguishing education from mere instruction, we say that there is no national education going on at present, outside of the Church. Thirdly, there is and there has been national education; and it is all the work of the Catholic Church.

The first point is readily shown. Decadence in the results of instruction in Germany, decadence in France, decadence in Italy is the theme of dolorous monologues, and the subject of parliamentary animadversion, on the part of publicists, and demagogues, of deputies and pedagogues in all those countries. The modern secular movement in public instruction has affected England the same way. And, notwithstanding tables of "Illiterates and otherwise," the United States seem not to be out of line with the rest.

The second point refers to education as distinct from mere secular instruction. According to all accepted definitions, education means instruction and very much more. It signifies the development of all faculties, moral as well as intellectual; and the moral more than the intellectual. For a man is always a man, if he is morally right and good. He is less than a man, and had preferably have been made a useful animal, if he is only equipped intellectually, to do moral evil more exquisitely. To this definition one serious

class of professional writers practically demur. They are the agriculturists and industrialists, who see in man only the best machine in the market, and consider instruction to be adequate, to be all education, if this human machine is made supple and agile, is tempered by gymnastics and made splendid by physical culture, and then is mounted on the rest of the machinery, like what they call a "governor" in engineering, to regulate all at a moderate expense.

Education does not exist outside of the Church's direct influence. For there is no power to teach, inform and mould the moral man, outside of the means which are invested in the Catholic Church alone. Systems of national and secular instruction bear the same relation to moral development, which technical knowledge in the mind bears to the passions and emotions of the human heart, almost the same relation as running a machine or turning a sentence to an act of contrition or of divine love. To be sure, running a machine or learning grammar may be made an act of moral and sublime virtue. But it takes the Church and her divine means to temper the human heart, so as to produce this or any other form of practical moral life.

The ministry of the sacraments is most directly efficacious, for they produce the life within. The ministry of teaching is most indispensable, for no one comes within reach of the sacraments, unless he is first taught. Hence St. Paul argues, that to be saved men must believe; "and how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard?" (Rom. x, 14.) The ministrations of the priests are void for want of subjects, unless his teaching has predisposed them. And, if we are to compare one kind of teaching with another, what is he who preaches to the adult, contrasted with him who instructs the young? The Abbé Bourdoise wrote to M. Olier, founder of St. Sulpice: "For my part, I assure you from the bottom of my heart, that I would beg from door to door to provide for a true schoolmaster. . . . I believe that a priest who was possessed of the science of the saints would make himself a schoolmaster, and so come to the honors of canonization. The best masters, the greatest, those most in credit,

the Doctors of the Sorbonne, would not be too good for this work. Because parish schools are poor, and kept by the poor, people imagine they are nothing. Yet it is the one means for destroying vices and planting virtue; and I defy all men together to find a better." Hence the Rev. Albert Barnes touched on a fine truth, with a penetration quite worthy of the spirit of evil in this world, when he said, as quoted above: "A Sister of Charity, teaching music and French and other such things, in a nunnery boarding-school, is a mightier agent than a priest with his Latin prayers and his maledictions and his holy water." We know what the priest can do, and how he alone can do it. It is clear what a Catholic teacher does, a work of preparation indispensable to the ministry. What wonder there should be no education going on outside of the Catholic Church—neither national nor private education!

Thirdly; has there never been what may be called national education, and is there none now? If we understand what is meant by the term "national" we shall see that it has been in progress for a long time, and it is thriving to-day.

The term "nation" has two meanings, one good and the other bad. It is a decidedly objectionable use of the word to designate by it whatever comes from a bureau, a minister, a committee of parliament or a department of State. There is some color for the usage, since these are institutions pertaining to the nation, salaried by the nation, and in other ways "national." But is every notion that emanates from the heads of the incumbents forthwith a "national" notion? Does every measure of theirs emanate from the bosom of the nation, and return with multiplied interest to the heart of the nation? In the present sense of human kind there is scarcely an idea more restricted, narrow, partisan, and possibly tyrannical, than that which is conveyed by the word "bureaucratic!" Yet by a ready fallacy the designation "national" which may or may not belong to the bureau, is slipped over to the measures which are propounded by the idiosyncracies of the bureau. Thus a minister of public

instruction, a department of education, excogitates a programme for the schools, devises a great system of schooling. And all at once it is NATIONAL. More correctly, it ought to be called revolutionary; since this phase of public administration began with the great Revolution. France, which inaugurated the European Revolution, inaugurated likewise this style of national administration, and of national instruction. And it has all been revolution ever since—in education as well as in everything else. For, in about a dozen years, Fourcroy had reason to report to Napoleon that the student classes knew no longer anything, not even orthography. In a little over a hundred years they have perpetrated their twenty-first official or national programme. And by all accounts the student classes are not only innocent of Latin, but also of French. . . . This is what comes of "national" education, when the term is employed to designate bureaucratic programmes, printed at the cost of the public exchequer and merely imposed by the force of the national executive.

But, let us take the word "national" in its true and good signification, as indicating what grows up in the hearts and manners of a people, what is part of their natural and moral life; and, if perfected by a discreet application of the canons of art, is so perfected only in accordance with the dictates of conscience, the right of individuals, and the aspirations of an upright nature towards virtue and enlightenment. Applied in this sense among a Christian people, the term "national education" means the formation of a Christian character in the young, instruction in religion, and advancement in secular branches of learning harmoniously with the principles, incentives and practice of Christian faith and morality. In this sense, the Church alone can impart or foster such education. It is the Church that introduced it into the world. Wherever she is, there she conducts or stimulates this and no other form of education. And, if any people have cut themselves off from the Catholic Church, and have so far forfeited her privileges, not the least part of forfeit consists in this, that, having received the gift of

national development and life which came only with her civilization, they are left without the appanage of true national education, which cannot go on without the rest.

The history of her method and means, among the nations, in accomplishing so integral a part of her civilizing mission may be indicated briefly; though a prolonged and accurate consideration were necessary to estimate her zeal, to appreciate her policy, and to learn the lessons of practical philosophy which shine forth in her conduct of the schools. We shall say just a word on the progress of elementary education, chiefly with regard to boys.

The reins of public instruction, through the instrumentality of the clergy and especially of the monks in their monasteries, were already well in hand, when the Third Ecumenical Council of Lateran, held in 1179, made it a subject of universal legislation, that every cathedral church should maintain a master to bestow gratuitous instruction on ecclesiastics and poor scholars. In the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Lateran, presided over by Leo X, a similar decree was formulated with this reason assigned, "because the Church of God, like a pious mother, is bound to provide for the indigent, in matters which regard either the help of the body or the profit of the soul." The next Ecumenical Council, that of Trent, began in its fifth session to treat questions of education. Every cathedral church had to provide a chair of theology. If the smallness of the revenues and the fewness of scholars did not justify such a foundation "at least the Bishop and Chapter must have masters to teach grammar to ecclesiastical students and poor scholars gratis."

The decrees of provincial councils followed on all sides. And what, in the natural course of things, was in any case the next stage in the civilization of Europe—a general, universal education of the young—was stimulated by formal enactments, was sanctioned by ecclesiastical penalties, and thus became a regular part of the Church's discipline wherever she exercises control.

There were three classes of persons on whom the labor of

education devolved—the secular clergy, the laity and the religious orders or congregations. On the secular clergy having the care of souls it rested as an ecclesiastical duty. Catholic lay persons came in to assist them, assuming this work as one of devotion and zeal, if it happened to suit their tastes. Finally religious orders sprang into existence with a special view to this work; and, receiving their authorization from the Holy See or from Bishops, entered with organized forces, united and diffusive, upon the field of education. This was only a new phase of an old work, long familiar in its earlier and less organized stages to the ancient orders

France, which was to be the arena of revolution in teaching, as well as in everything else, furnishes a specimen of how the secular clergy carried out the ecumenical and synodal decrees. Numerous provincial councils, beginning at the end of the sixteenth century, required that a master should be provided in every parish to teach children their religion with grammar. During the two centuries which followed, the synodal statutes contain the wisest instructions for teachers, the most pressing recommendations, with ordinances ever recurring and enjoining an increase in the number of schools. Bishop Huet, in 1694, ordained that no ecclesiastic should be admitted to discharge the functions of Vicar in a parish, except on condition of keeping the schools, when required to do so by his Curé. Conformably with the rules of the Church, he commanded that Curés should keep little schools for the instruction of children; this they should do in person, or through their Vicars, or other persons of virtue and capacity. Mgr. De Tesse, the Bishop of Coutances, in 1682, prescribing the acquisition of reading and writing as simultaneous with learning the practices of piety and religion, adds the reason that the children "may be in a condition to sing the praises of God, and to protect themselves from the deceptions which are only too frequent among men." The visitation of their diocese by successive Archbishops of Bourdeaux included an accurate and minute inspection of the parish schools.

In this way, the pious persons of both sexes who, remain-

ing in the world, devoted themselves to the assistance of the clergy as teachers in the schools, became objects of special solicitude to the Bishops. The Bishop of Chalons, Mgr. Vialart de Herse, cousin of M. Olier, issued an ordinance in 1676, enjoining a spiritual retreat on all the masters of his diocese. The retreat was conducted in the seminary at the expense of the Prelate, who preached to them himself, and had them otherwise instructed in the important duties of their profession. He composed a book, *L'École Chrétienne*, containing meditations for teachers, with instructions and directions. This, with another book of chants, he distributed throughout his diocese.

Such a system of universal education required money, and much of it. Two sources were open. One is referred to when mention is made of parents paying the "accustomed tax," for the support of the schools of the parish. The other was the more important and ample source of funds. It was the liberal endowment of Christian schools, as an eminent work of piety on the part of both clergy and laity. A new channel was opened for the usual liberality of the faithful, who from the beginning of Christendom had built churches and monasteries, had founded colleges and works of mercy. These gifts are the expression in terms of temporal goods of that same spirit of sacrifice which prompts the religious orders to bestow, in charity and mercy, their personal service and undivided labors for life.

Thus we find Bishops and priests consecrating their fortunes and the revenues of their benefices to the endowment of gratuitous schools. In some cases, schools were created at the cost of the ecclesiastical benefices themselves; inasmuch as the incumbents allowed their livings to be extinguished, to the end that the fruits thereof might be applied to so good a work. Instances are quoted from Brittany. We can understand that the devout laity were not behindhand, with such examples set before them by their pastors.

However, the secular clergy, even though seconded by the laity, could not apply themselves with undivided attention to so laborious a ministry as education. They were taken

up with the active care of souls in other ways. All their vigilance could not succeed in keeping secular schoolmasters up to the level of so high a profession. Hence the religious life, active from the beginning of the Church in so many fields of zeal, now yielded a new form of orders and congregations, institutes especially established for teaching, either as the exclusive, or at least as a principal object of their vocation.

As early as the fourteenth century, a canon of Deventer, Gerard Groot, began the apostolate which, in the seventeenth century, the Bl. de la Salle was to carry on with such signal fruit for the Church. Groot had founded a community of clerics, called Brothers of the Common Life, who instructed children in reading, writing, religion and some mechanical arts. From the Netherlands, where they commenced, these Brothers extended their labors along both sides of the Rhine, through Westphalia, Saxony, Pomerania, Switzerland, Silesia. Later on came the Doctrinaires, founded at Cavaillon, in 1592, by the Ven. Cæsar de Bus. Then the Brethren and Fathers of the Pious Schools were founded at Rome by St. Joseph Calasanctius in 1597 ; and these spread from Italy into Germany, and as far as Poland, even in the life-time of their founder. In 1604, a Vicar-General at Lyons, M. Démia, and some others elsewhere, endeavored to constitute schoolmasters themselves into pious communities ; but without success. The profession and practice of religious perfection, under the sanction of the vows, has alone been successful in this field of enterprise. Finally, the Abbé de la Salle applied himself to the work, and founded the Congregation of Brothers of the Christian Schools. Himself a man of quality, a dignitary of the Church, he began by extending his protection and largesses to some poor schoolmasters, and ended by making himself poor and a schoolmaster for the poor. He succeeded so well in his divine work, that, when the revolution of 1789 broke out, it found all over France no fewer than a thousand Brothers conducting 120 schools.

As to the pedagogical method followed, a little book, *L'École paroissiale*, which was in use during the seventeenth

century, lays down the method of instruction in reading, writing, orthography, arithmetic ; and also, if the boys were promising, in the elements of Latin. Such a programme, with a good method of teaching, is ample for elementary instruction ; the more so, when we remember that printed programmes, after the modern fashion, do not prove any advancement in either method or solidity, or the real extent of teaching. An excellent method with oral teaching prominent, and less of text-books learnt off slavishly by heart, make much better scholars than a multitude of text-books, a crowd of branches, and cheap programmes. Twenty-odd official programmes in a hundred years, upsetting colleges, schools, courses, twenty-odd times in a century, prove to demonstration that programmes do not cost much, and the newest conceit proves also that the last programme was not worth much, scarcely more than its successor is likely to be. The method approved by generations, a method truly national, as being experimental and traditional, perfected by the experience of men devoted like Bl. de la Salle, and yielding the fruits as well of sound piety as of competency for the duties of life, is the exclusive means by which a national system of education can be worked. It is of the Church, and under the Church ; it is from the people and in the people ; and it is conducted by the natural guardians, friends and benefactors of the faithful of Christ—the clergy, the religious orders, and the pious laity.

We have spoken, in the most summary way, of a vast system of popular instruction, to which not the slightest allusion is made in pedagogical histories as commonly written. We have scarcely referred to the elementary education of girls ; though in France there were ordinarily two schools of charity in each parish, one for each sex. We have omitted entirely the great system of higher collegiate and university education. And we have taken our illustrations, for want of space, chiefly from one country.[1]

1 On this subject of primary education in France, the researches of M. le chanoine Ernest Allain, in different volumes of the *Revue des Questions Historiques* are replete with information.

Let us close with observations drawn from the same quarter. The harangues of the revolutionists in the Convention, and in the Council of Five Hundred, the reports of Chaptal, member of the Council of State to Napoleon, are overwhelming in their testimony, however spitefully rendered, that education had been universal, that it had been excellent, and that the "clerical," or, as it was then called, the "fanatical" system of the Christian schools, alone won and retained the confidence of parents. The revolution had upset everything; and to-day, a century later, it has not succeeded, either in France or elsewhere, in founding anything that is excellent or permanent. It is dragging in its trail a universal decadence, literary as well as moral. It has no interest in education, except as spying therein a splendid political machine, or a ready way to affluence by means of the public funds. Its most advanced liberal minds are not more liberal than M. La Chalotais, whose reports to the French Parliament against the Jesuits have formed a kind of text to the infidel world. This liberal philosopher, having helped to clear the ground of the Society of Jesus, drew up a plan of studies on his own account for the conduct of a new "national" education: *Essai d'Education Nationale, 1763.* He expressed his indignation that "every body now wanted to study," and that the "Frères Ignorantins," successors and rivals of the Jesuits, "coming on the ground to destroy everything, teach reading and writing to people who ought to learn nothing else but how to fashion and mend quills for others." Then he formulated this principle: "The good of society demands that the knowledge of the people do not extend beyond their occupations. For common folk it is hardly necessary to know how to read and write, except for such as live by these arts, or whom these arts help to live." These sentiments, still in proof, La Chalotais submitted to Voltaire. And the latter replied: "I cannot thank you too much, monsieur, for having given me a foretaste of what you destine for France. . . . I find your views useful. I thank you for proscribing study among the laboring classes. I who cultivate a farm beg to tender you a request, that you will obtain for

me hand-laborers, and not tonsured clerks. Above all, send me *Frères Ignorantins* to drive my ploughs and to mend them."*

THOMAS HUGHES, S.J.

St. Louis University,
St. Louis, Mo.

THE RUBRICS OF THE MASS.

He that contemneth small things shall fall by little and little.—*Ecclesiasticus.*

A contemptu nescio quomodo excusari possint istas (missae) caeremonias omittentes saepe saepius, imo immutantes, transferentes et confundentes.—*Turrino.*

Inasmuch as the action which you are about to perform is one of no small peril, I advise you, my dear sons, before celebrating Mass, to learn carefully from well-instructed priests the order of the whole Mass and everything relating to the Consecration, Breaking and Communion of the Sacred Host. —*Rite of Ordination.*

WHEN the elder clergy of X— get together and begin exchanging reminiscences, one name that is sure to figure prominently in the conversation is that of Bishop M., the saintly and scholarly Ordinary who ruled their diocese during the fifth and sixth decades of the present century. Ever zealous for God's honor and glory, and somewhat punctilious as to the order and decency of all religious functions, this prelate had especially at heart the exact observance by his clergy of the rites and ceremonies of the Holy Sacrifice. In pastoral letters and synodal conferences he frequently insisted upon the necessity of a priest's reviewing from time to time both the rubrics of the Missal and the decrees of the Sacred Congregation relating thereto; and, if local tradition does not belie him, he once enforced the same lesson in a manner as drastic as it was novel.

The incident, still spoken of as the "rubrical dinner," is said to have occurred on the occasion of a popular pastor's silver jubilee. Bishop M. and about a dozen of his priests

* Quoted by E. Allain, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1875, T. I, p. 133.

arrived in the jubilarian's parish on the eve of the celebration; and the next morning low Masses were going on at Father B.'s three altars from six until eight o'clock. That the Bishop should hear one Mass preparatory to saying his own, and another by way of thanksgiving, was a matter of course; but his remaining in the sanctuary during still a third Mass was commented on as an additional instance of his ever-increasing piety. In the meanwhile, whether by accident or design, the Bishop's *prie-dieu* and chair were so placed in the sanctuary as to afford him an excellent view of all three altars; and a close observer might have noticed that the prelate's attention seemed to be pretty equally divided, his eyes following the movements, now of one celebrant, now of another, until the conclusion of the last low Mass. The Bishop displayed his usual affability at the breakfast-table; assisted at the throne during the Solemn Mass celebrated by the jubilarian; and preached a strong sermon in the course of which he paid a warm tribute to the worth and works of the exemplary pastor whose festival they were met to honor. Mass being concluded, and Father B. having made suitable replies to the congratulatory addresses presented by his parishioners and his brother clerics, bishop and priests spent an hour or so in pleasant converse before they were summoned to dinner.

Once in the dining-room, Bishop M. suddenly appeared in an extraordinary *rôle* which furnished the guests with a series of surprises from the soup to the walnuts, and led not a few of them to suspect that their Ordinary was afflicted with an attack of temporary insanity. For the time being, he seemed to have forgotten even the elemental rules of table etiquette, violating all the canons of polite living as recklessly and systematically as the most vulgar of half-famished street Arabs at a Thanksgiving festival.

Having adjusted his napkin around his neck after the manner of a baby's bib or a barber's towel, he drank his soup with audible gulps, smacking his lips as he swallowed the last drop of the liquid which he had tilted his plate to scoop up; took a leg of roast turkey in his fingers, and ate

the dressing with his knife; reached over his neighbor's plate to help himself to dishes a little removed from him; drank his coffee from the saucer with both elbows resting on the table; and, having satisfied an apparently ravenous appetite before the other guests had nearly finished their meal, pushed back his chair, threw one leg over the other, and began ostentatiously to pick his teeth with his penknife. This astounding performance was not of course calculated to promote geniality, and although some of the priests, ignoring the eccentric behaviour of the Bishop, endeavored to keep the conversational ball rolling, it was manifestly uphill work. To several remarks addressed to him at the beginning of the dinner, Bishop M. paid no attention whatever, although he once or twice broke into an uproarious laugh at some very mild witticisms from guests at the other end of the table. To an inquiry from Father B. whether he was feeling quite well, he laconically replied "Tiptop"; and then relapsed into silence until the end of the repast. The end came somewhat sooner than in ordinary circumstances would have been the case. Short work was made of the concluding courses, and the host was about to give the signal for rising, when the Bishop shutting his penknife and drawing closer to the table, raised his hand and in his usual courteous manner, said, "Just a moment, Father B." Then turning to the expectant guests, he continued:

"It goes without saying, gentlemen, that the singularity of my conduct during the past half-hour has filled you with surprise, not to say consternation; and I owe it to you all, and more particularly to our host, to offer some explanation of that conduct. In one word, then, I have been endeavoring to give you an object-lesson in rubrics, or rather, in the neglect of them. You may have noticed that I was present this morning while nine among you celebrated low Mass; but you did not perhaps remark that I paid particular attention as to *how* you celebrated. In disregarding, as I have done during this dinner, all rules of etiquette, I have merely tried to reproduce the neglect which some of you habitually show to the rubrics of the Missal; and the boorish vulgarity

with which I have ignored social observances has assuredly not caused you such disgust and pain as the mutilated rites and ceremonies of this morning caused me. The rules of table etiquette which I have transgressed are, after all, purely directive, or even if they be considered preceptive, certainly do not oblige either *sub gravi* or *levi*. With the rubrics of the Mass, you do not need to be told, the case is far otherwise. I have merely to add, gentlemen, that I apologize very sincerely to Father B. for having marred the pleasantness of his dinner, and I trust that some of your number will apologize just as sincerely to Almighty God for your irreverence, precipitation and neglect of rubrics in the celebration of the adorable sacrifice."

Even were the whole story apocryphal, one might well say, "se non è vero, è ben trovato"; for nothing is surer than that just such a lesson would prove very beneficial to many ecclesiastics by impressing upon their minds a realization of the multiplied faults of which they are guilty in celebrating Mass. In a certain Canadian diocese, some years ago, there was prevalent among the confessors of priestly penitents, a practice which experience proved rather commendable, that of giving as an occasional "penance" the attentive reading of the rubrics of low Mass. The average priest who performed this satisfaction for the first time was thoroughly convinced of its *raison d'etre*, and a notable improvement in the observance of the rubrics was the natural result.

Not to trench at all upon the vexed question as to whether a number of the minor rubrics of the Missal are preceptive or directive, one may surely deplore the inattention often paid to them, without meriting the reproach of finical niceness implied in the epithet "rubric fiend." At the very least, even the most purely directive of these rules of the Missal embody the worthiest and most reverent method of offering a sacrifice that is incomparably the greatest action performable on earth—a sacrifice so sublime that its most inconsiderate minister can scarcely believe anything pertaining to it to be a matter of trifling moment. Of the Mass may be said, in a truer sense than ever Emerson dreamt of,

"There is no great and no small
To the Soul that knoweth all;"

and a priest may well feel that the least obligatory of the directions laid down for its celebration merits more of his attentive heed than do most other actions of his day.

It is not the directive rubrics only, however, that are violated with lamentable frequency by priests who either have never learned how to say Mass properly, or have neglected to correct, by occasionally reviewing the rubrics, the faults into which they have been betrayed by forgetfulness, inadvertence and routinism. In a valuable supplement to his *Cérémonial Romain*, Falise treats of the faults ordinarily committed in the celebration of Mass, and of the no fewer than fifty-three he instances, many are transgressions against rubrics which are very certainly preceptive. That some clerics profess to attribute no importance whatever to various details of the ceremonies of the Holy Sacrifice (details which they themselves habitually neglect) is explicable only on the presumption that with them "the wish is father to the thought"; and they seem quite oblivious of the fact that their inconsistency is made glaringly manifest by the weight which they give to the other details not a particle more authoritatively prescribed. In this matter of rubrics, indeed, priests not infrequently

"Compound with sins they are inclined to
By damning those they have not mind to,"

as if their vigorous condemnation of the lapses made by others were a species of compensation for the faults of which they themselves are guilty. Like Bishop Warburton's witty distinction, "Orthodoxy is my doxy; heterodoxy is another man's doxy," the difference, in the estimation of many a priest, between the two kinds of rubrics seems to be, "Preceptive rubrics are those I observe; directive ones are those I neglect."

Of the genuine importance of *all* the rubrics of the Missal, it is easy to form a correct estimate by weighing well the terms of this extract from the bull prefixed to the Missal of

Pius V: "Mandantes et districte omnibus et singulis . . . in virtute sanctae obedientiae praecipientes, ut . . . Missam juxta ritum, modum ac normam quae per Missale hoc a Nobis nunc traditur, decantant ac legant, neque in Missae celebratione alias caeremonias vel preces, quam quae hoc Missali continentur, addere vel recitare praesumant." The intent of this paragraph is very clearly to make the observance of the rubrics of the Missal strictly obligatory; and where the very wording of the rubric itself does not obviously show a mere counsel, the non-existence of obligation can scarcely be presumed. The washing of the hands, for instance, and the preparation of the Missal in the sacristy, by disposing the "signacula" in their proper places, are both ordained under the general heading, *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae;* and it is an inadequate justification of neglect of either act to state that one's hands are already clean, or that one always prepares the Mass before descending the altar steps to begin the psalm, *Judica me, Deus.* This going to the corner of the altar, opening the Missal, and verifying the proper arrangement of the "signacula" before descending to begin the psalm, is merely the accomplishment of another and a separate rubric; and does not at all obviate the necessity of conforming to that which prescribes the previous finding of the Mass in the sacristy.

The ordinary priest who has not from time to time renewed his study of the rubrics, would probably be more than surprised to hear of the number of points in which his practise differs from the ordained "ritum, modum ac normam" of saying Mass, the positive faults of which he is habitually guilty, the distorted and mutilated ceremonies to which he has accustomed himself, but for which he can cite the authority of no rubricist great or little, ancient or modern. Fortunate for him if he has a brother priest candid enough to call his attention to his numerous lapses—and skillful enough to do so without wounding his self-esteem. Better still if, seeing the necessity for reform in his method of celebrating the adorable sacrifice, he has the good sense to recommence the study of the Mass from *De Praeparatione*

Sacerdotis Celebraturi, thoroughly learning a little daily until he knows and observes the most minute rubric.

The Ordinary of a diocese, according to a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, cannot escape responsibility for the neglect or violation of rubrics among the clergy under his jurisdiction. "Ordinarius stricte tenetur opportunis remediis providere, ut Rubricae et S. R. C. Decreta rite serventur; siquid dubii occurat, recurrendum ad S. C. pro declaratione." Few Ordinaries, presumably, would consider such a course of action as Bishop M.'s rubrical dinner an opportune remedy for abuses however great; but some have instituted practices more available and not less effective. One such practice is the "rehearsal" or "moot" Mass at the regular ecclesiastical retreat, or at one of the several conferences held in the course of the year. In the presence of all the clergy, assembled in the sacristy or other convenient apartment where the Blessed Sacrament is not kept, one of the younger priests vests, and goes through all the ceremonies of the Mass. His every movement, position and action is critically noted by the on-lookers, and objection is promptly taken to whatever may appear to any one of their number a deviation from the order prescribed by the rubrics or the ceremonial recognized as authoritative in the diocese. When such objection is raised the celebrant proceeds no further until the point has been thoroughly discussed and finally decided by reference to the authorities mentioned. The exercise, if seriously conducted, may occupy an hour and a half or two hours; but it is time exceedingly well spent, and few, if any, of the participants fail to "learn something new" from the practice.

It clearly does not enter into the scope of such a paper as this to mention a moiety of the faults which rubricists note as commonly occurring in the celebration of the Mass; but as more interest attaches to the particular and concrete than to the general and abstract, it may be permissible to specify just a few points about which the reader may readily discover defects of his own, or, at least, of some of his clerical acquaintances. And first, the inclination of the body, to be

made during the *Confiteor*, as also at the *Munda cor meum*, the *Te igitur* and the *Supplices te rogamus*, should be profound; that is, the body should be bent far enough to allow the knees to be touched by the hands. Unless a good many priests have abnormally long arms, their inclinations are less profound than moderate. The custom of bending either the body or the head while making the genuflexion (*unico genu*) is not only ungraceful but incorrect, even at or after the Consecration. The minor reverence is included in the greater, the inclination in the genuflexion, which, as Wapelhorst and other liturgists teach, "semper fit absque capitis vel corporis inclinatione." The devotional sentiment which probably inspires the act may well give way to a desire exactly to conform to the rubrics. The sign of the cross should be made in straight lines, not in arcs of circles or in parabolic curves; and to substitute for it a scooping of the air with the hand, or, still worse, a mere gyratory movement of the fingers, is to travesty one of the most venerable of ceremonies. The *Orate fratres*, the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* and the *Domine non sum dignus* ought to be, but commonly are not, said in a lower tone of voice than the other portions of the Mass, which are said aloud. The hands, when extended, should be not farther apart or nearer together than the width of the shoulders; when elevated, they should not be raised higher than the shoulders; and in both positions they should be so held that the palms shall face each other.

Attentive consideration of the foregoing points, and of dozens of similar ones to be found in any good Ceremonial, can scarcely fail to benefit the ecclesiastic. The transcendent sublimity of the Holy Sacrifice would demand such consideration, even were the rubrics optional instead of compulsory. It is attention to details that ensures the beauty and harmony of any ceremony: and no priest can celebrate Mass with congruous impressiveness unless he accurately observes "the little things" of the rubrics.

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C.S.C.

St. Joseph's College, St. Joseph, N. B., Canada.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

TWENTIETH ARTICLE.

MORAL THEOLOGY.—(V.)—ITS LIMITATIONS.

ONE of the most striking differences between the moral teachings of the Catholic Church and those of Protestantism or philosophy is found in the fulness and assurance of the former as compared with the habitual vagueness and hesitancy of the latter. The guidance of the Catholic Church is preeminently practical; it covers the whole ground of human conduct and traces out a course easy to most, accessible to all, yet offering perfect security to those who follow it. At first sight nothing seems wanting to its completeness; but a closer examination reveals the fact that it remains unfinished on every side; that in each one of its aspects, much remains which still may be discovered, much also which of its nature is hidden from human knowledge, to be seen only when the veil is withdrawn and the narrow present vanishes into the boundless future. To consider the limits within which, as a necessity or as a fact, moral theology is thus confined, will, it seems to us, be a considerable help to a proper understanding of the science.

Moral theology embraces in theory the whole field of human action and has for its object to determine the existence, the extent, the gravity, the underlying principles of all human obligations, and of the responsibilities consequent on them. We have to see how far this object has been or may be effected, and in what it necessarily falls short.

I.

As regards the question of their existence.

(1) There are primordial duties which have been held as indubitable at all times by all races of men. Such are the duties of justice, benevolence, gratitude, religious reverence, a certain restraint of the lower appetites, and the like. They are always taken for granted, appealed to as self-evident and never demonstrated because of their very evidence.

(2) The number of these unquestioned obligations has been increasing in the course of ages, under the influence of divinely revealed truth, or as the outcome of progressive civilization. The Jewish code of morals was far in advance of that of the pagans; the Christian law corrected and completed in many particulars that of the Jews. Stoicism awakened the Roman empire to the consciousness of many duties unheeded in earlier times. A steady growth of ascertained moral truths is noticeable even in the Church, the law of development having its application fully as much and for the same reasons in moral as in dogmatic theology. In many cases where the Fathers hesitated, we to-day are certain. To determine moral duty they turned mainly to Scripture. "What Scripture forbids we may not do," says S. Basil (Regul. brevior. I), "and what it commands we should not fail to accomplish. But as regards those things on which it is silent, we have the rule of the Apostle: *All things are lawful for me, but all do not edify.*" The difficulty was to gather anything like a definite rule either from the Old Testament, amid maxims and examples often perplexing, to say the least, and remote from the spirit of the Gospel; or from the Gospel itself, admirably clear as a direction and an impulse, but vague and indefinite as an obligatory law. It was reserved to the schoolmen to work out the problem systematically and in all its details, with the result of gifting us at the present day with a more definite and better ascertained rule of life than the world possessed at any previous period.

(3) Yet the work is far from having reached its end. Our books of moral theology are still full of varying conceptions of duty. True, there is a happy tendency to agreement on many points long controverted. But agreement on such matters, recent or ancient, does not necessarily imply the final settlement of them. All know the varying fortunes of certain opinions; how some spring up suddenly into life and rapidly win favor; how others, long universally believed in, gradually lose their hold on men's minds and finally disappear. Thus, to confine ourselves to a few more obvious

instances, it was the disposition of the Fathers to erect into positive commands some of the evangelical counsels in regard to such subjects as chastity, matrimony, worldly pursuits, alms-giving, forbearance under injury, self-defence and the like. But what was extreme in their views gradually gave way to a more correct estimate of human nature, still weak even when regenerated. In the opposite direction several objectionable practices, such as judiciary combats and duelling, introduced by the barbarians, were long tolerated, invested even with religious sanctions in many places, and yielded but slowly to the prohibitions of the Church. Theologians themselves clung for many centuries to the ancient tradition forbidding "usury," understood as the practice of making money by lending money. They were long unanimous in maintaining the so-called "principle of equality" in contracts to which modern society has substituted the much more intelligible principle of mutual freedom.

Again, oaths were long considered as binding even when extorted by fraud or by fear, if only they could be kept without sin. Paternal authority was upheld by the earlier theologians to an extent and with consequences to which nobody could give countenance at the present day. Slavery was as universally and as readily admitted in past times as it is condemned in ours. Changes of a similar kind might be pointed out in various other directions, all going to show the fluctuating and uncertain character of moral rules long unanimously acquiesced in, and suggesting the possibility of more than one point, upon which there is present agreement, being re-opened and discussed afresh, just as is happening to-day in regard to so many social and scientific problems. Happily the reflex principals which play so important a part in human conduct are ever at hand to direct our course or to reassure us despite our speculative uncertainties.

II.

The existence of each duty once ascertained, a second question naturally arises: How far does it extend? to what exactly does it bind us?

Here again we have the same combination of certainties and uncertainties. In the case of negative duties: "thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal," etc., the general law is clear enough, as also in the case of positive duties, when they are of a definite kind, such as paying one's debts, obedience to parents, and the like. But almost all such laws are subject to limitations, some again evident, but many others determined only with much difficulty, and leaving to the end a considerable margin of vagueness and uncertainty. Thus, for example, we are bound to pay our debts, but only when physically and morally able to do so. Physical impossibilities are easily ascertained; moral possibilities and impossibilities, on the contrary, as all theologians know, are extremely difficult to determine with any precision. Again, we are bound to avoid causing injury to others. Yet directly or indirectly, remotely or proximately, we are doing it, in some measure, or sharing in it, almost every day without scruple, doubtless because we consider that there is a sufficient reason for our doing so. But when is the reason sufficient?

The character of indefiniteness is still more sensible in certain positive duties. Who, for instance, can tell the man of wealth just what he is bound to do for the needy hundreds who appeal to him, or for the thousands whom he knows to be in deep distress? The sinner is subject to the natural and divine law of atonement, but strictly obliged to what? The Christian acknowledges the obligation of prayer. Christ tells us to pray always. When is the precept fulfilled in its integrity? Again He describes the giving of scandal as a terrible evil, and the misfortune of being exposed to it as a thing to avoid at the cost of what is most necessary and most dear to us. How are we to interpret all this practically?

Questions of this kind arise on all sides, especially in connection with duties of a general nature, forming, as it were, a deep fringe of penumbra around the central light of clearly defined obligations. To narrow this shadow more and more is the constant effort of moral theology, indeed, we may say of the human conscience, and, considering the imperfection

of the data, the results arrived at are truly remarkable. The individual man, were he compelled to face such problems alone, could only feel his inability to grapple with them. But he knows that he is not alone, and as soon as perplexity arises as to the extent of any one of his duties, he instinctively looks around him to see how it is measured by his fellow-men, especially by those who are deemed upright and good, and he feels safe provided he does just as they do.

If he is a Catholic, he looks to the Church or to his confessor speaking in her name, considering that it is part of their mission to warn him if he unconsciously fails in the peformance of any important duty. The Church in turn and the confessor gather light from what is found and from what is absent from the traditions, the laws, the accepted customs of Christian ages, from the teachings of the Fathers and the mind of the Saints, more likely, because of their nearness to God, to know the full extent of His will.

But, underlying it all:—behind the appreciations of the Saints, of the Fathers, of theologians, confessors and the public at large, there is a certain fundamental conception or philosophy of human life, individual and collective, of its practical possibilities and of its ultimate purposes, upon which all is unconsciously yet really built. To put it in a few words, the supreme law of man is that of the homage of his whole being to God. The will of God—necessary as regards what is due to Himself—free in all else—is the complete rule of human action. What God means man to do and to be, that and that alone is his duty. Now, without entering into particulars, the object of the Divine will would seem to be substantially *the conservation and progress of the idividual and of society.* All man's moral impulses lead in that direction and converge toward that end. It is the standard to which we instinctively compare human actions and declare them good or evil. Whatever perfects man singly or collectively we believe to be pleasing to God; whatever weakens or lessens him, especially in the moral order which is felt to be supreme, we unhesitatingly declare to be wrong.

Besides this general direction, there are certain other more

special lines of development along which man is led by his moral sense, and which are determined by the peculiar manner in which he is made. For man is not merely a rational being in general; he is a rational and moral being of a definite kind, offering a combination of special elements, sensations, emotions, thoughts, fancies, principles, etc., etc., —acting and reacting under special laws and limitations. It is just these that give human duty not only its individual character but also its true limits. And this is why that unconscious philosophy to which we refer, built on an obscure yet real and concrete sense of things, feels itself able to determine the extent of obligations where abstract reason is unequal to the task. Where the philosopher hesitates because he sees only the general features of the case, the practical man intuitively grasps all the elements and reaches a decision.

In this way, then, much of the vagueness of duty has been removed. The process continues and is bound to continue, with the result of making man's obligations ever clearer and more definite. Yet something of indeterminateness clings to several of them fatally; and will remain to the end. Besides, the constant change of surroundings, adaptation to which is as much a law of the moral as of the physical life, will ever continue to raise new doubts according as the older ones are dispelled, thus leaving the science incomplete in this as in its other aspects.

III.

A full knowledge of our duties would imply not only our recognizing clearly their existence, and seeing distinctly how far they extend, but also the possibility of our determining accurately their degree of urgency. For each one of them has its definite measure of importance: each fault has its exact degree of guilt. Between the slightest obligation and the weightiest; between the faintest beginnings of evil and its lowest depths, there are degrees without number. It is with them as with colors, few in their original simplicity,

yet so varied in nature that art is powerless to reproduce them with perfect accuracy. In the Gobelins tapestry-works each color reckons tones by the hundred, from the darkest to the brightest, passing from one to the other so imperceptibly that only the trained eye of the artist can detect a difference between those which follow in close succession; yet their fifteen thousand different dyes are found inadequate—a true picture of the countless shades of moral obligation and of the moral evil consequent on its violation.

Theology can offer no means of measuring them. It easily recognizes, of course, some evils as greater than others; it has also its distinction of imperfections, venial and mortal sins. But such a classification is at most a rough and rudimentary one, much like that of dividing all men into the good and the wicked, or the rich and the poor. It includes under the same denomination cases extremely unlike one another, an act of deep deliberate villainy and a transient weakness being both called mortal sins, though a single case of the former may be worse than a hundred of the latter.

The theological distinction itself is not devoid of difficulty. If imperfection is displeasing to God, as implying a voluntary departure from His will, it is not easy to see how it is not sinful; nor is it easier to understand how the worst of venial and the lightest of mortal sins, with scarce a shadow of perceptible difference between them, should nevertheless be separated, in themselves and in their consequences, by an almost incalculable distance.

But accepting it such as it is, its application is often one of extreme difficulty. Thus, we know that the worst passions are only the abnormal development of what are originally blameless impulses. When do they become simply objectionable, when positively sinful, when grievously so? Waste of time is reprehensible; when is it properly a sin? What amount of money may a man squander in the indulgence of his fancies or his follies, without incurring a grave responsibility? We object to the habit of betting or gambling, yet very few scruple to indulge in a solitary act of either, and who can say just when the gambler may be stopped in his

course by the threat of eternal perdition? To injure a man in his possessions is wrong; but when is it a grievous wrong? How much does it take to constitute a mortal sin? Here is a case of every day occurrence, and theologians in trying to solve it tell us many true and helpful things. They remark that it takes more when one has only shared in the injustice than if he alone were to cause it; that much depends on the position of the injured party, on the view he is likely to take, or should if reasonable take, of the harm done him; on the way the wrong was done—stealthily or violently, deliberately or by carelessness or neglect; on the very title by which he held that of which he has been deprived; for although the civil law places all cases of ownership on the same level, natural right admits many shades of difference between them. But all this helps more to show the complexity of the problem than to solve it, and in the end our theologians themselves can only form conjectures.

Much more perhaps is conjectural in such distinctions (between mortal and venial) than is generally thought. There are, of course, crimes which all civilized nations have looked upon with horror; there are practices which, if viewed leniently, would soon prove subversive of the providential order to which we visibly belong; there are deeds so frequently and so strongly denounced in Holy Writ that we have to consider them as capable of separating the soul from God, even though their intrinsic evil may not be apparent to us. But even here exaggeration is possible, still more in the region of positive law, where the fear of hell has been made to play more, perhaps, than its due part in order to secure a more prompt and more thorough obedience.

However that may be, it is always a grave and solemn act to trace a line of separation leading to such terrible issues. The Fathers were slow to do it. They confined themselves to what was most obvious, as do those good people of the present day whose sole concern is to know the will of God and to accomplish it. To ascertain just how far they may be unfaithful without incurring eternal damnation, has nothing more practical in it for them than for a dutiful son to consider

what faults would lead to his expulsion from his father's home. The distinction is serviceable only to coarse, weak or ungenerous souls, or to the priests who strive to preserve them or to rescue them from what is worst. It is to help the latter, principally, in the ministry of the confessional, that theologians have carried their distinction of what is mortal and venial into every branch of human duty. Their rulings are naturally of unequal and varying value, a fact which perplexed confessors are sometimes glad to remember, and which might induce them, in turn (besides other reasons), to dwell less on such sharp divisions than some do in their instructions to the faithful.

IV.

But even though it were possible to trace a distinct, clear-cut line of division between mortal and venial sin in every sphere of duty, it could after all respond only to the objective side of the question. Yet the subjective side is, in all its particulars, a no less essential element. Indeed the moral value of human action is principally determined by the mental and moral condition of the agent, and that condition can be ascertained only in a very imperfect way.

Here lies what may be considered perhaps the principal weakness of moral science; its inability to measure with anything like accuracy the moral value, positive or negative, of individual actions.

The positive value of an action, as all know, is in the motive. But what gives its moral value to the motive? Three things: its elevation, its purity and its intensity. As regards the first, even in the order of virtues, there are motives higher than others, and it may not be difficult to establish the hierarchical position of each, or to ascertain its presence and moving power in a given action. But to measure its purity is out of the question. Motives scarce ever act alone. In our most generous deeds there is always something of self; and as for our daily life, we are borne along by countless impulses, good, bad, and indifferent, of whose presence we are for the most part very imperfectly conscious,

and whose real power and relative share in our actions are to us a still greater mystery. As regards the intensity of the virtuous motive considered in itself, it cannot be measured at all, if for no other reason because there is no standard to measure it by.

Still less can we attempt to determine the measure of moral evil. The man who sins is guilty in proportion to his general moral enlightenment; to the special knowledge he has of the evil contained in or consequent on his action; to his advertence or present consciousness of the same; in proportion also to the freedom of his action, which in turn is determined by his antecedent habits, by the actual power of his evil impulses, by his natural strength of will and consequent ability to resist them, by the amount of help which comes to him from without, that is, from his surroundings or from the grace of God. Now what is all this but a series of varying quantities, of which we cannot expect ever to reach even the approximate value?

All human responsibility is limited. It varies from one to another, and in the same individual it varies with times, conditions and objects. The case, in particular, of a man who sins with his eyes open is clear enough in one respect. But how judge that of the man who does wrong through ignorance? It is easy speculatively to draw a distinction between vincible and invincible ignorance; but there are numberless degrees in both, and it is almost impossible to say where they meet in the concrete. Between two men who do evil, one consciously and the other through ignorance or inadvertence, there seems to be the widest difference; and yet the guilt of the latter may be very great, though he never at any time fully opened his eyes to the fact that he was unfaithful to duty. Similar responsibilities arising from thoughtlessness, neglect, or the unconscious or vaguely conscious working of unworthy inclinations in the soul form one of the deepest and most unfathomable mysteries of the moral life. The very freedom of the will is in all its aspects one of the greatest of mysteries. All attempts to analyze or explain, seem only to destroy it, and if the world continues

to believe in it still, it is in spite of argument and as an intuitive indestructible condition of the human mind. But the more we watch its action, the more we are convinced of its manifold practical limitations, making man less, on the whole, of a free agent than he gives himself credit for.

The consequence of all this is that we can know but very imperfectly the real moral value of other men, and that even of our own worth we never can be sure. On the subjective still more than on the objective side of morals our knowledge is variously limited, some things being seen distinctly, others vaguely, while many are hidden out of sight and, it may be, beyond our reach. Such being our natural condition, as Aristotle observes, just in this connection (Moral. I, 3), "it is the part of an educated man to require exactness in each class of subjects only as far as the nature of the subject admits." If, after all, moral science has succeeded in ascertaining the chief component elements of the moral world and its principal laws, has it not done as much for it as physics and chemistry have done for the physical universe? Both worlds offer an endless variety and complexity of forms, combinations ever new of their primordial elements, now hiding, now revealing their secrets, and equally attractive in what they tell and in what they conceal. And as in natural, so in moral science there is constant growth. Through a deeper and more accurate knowledge of the soul, of human nature, of life, the older problems are coming to be more accurately solved, while new questions and new views are ever widening the moral horizon. On the other hand, by the steady expansion of the political, juridical and social sciences, moral theology is ever stirred up to fresh efforts, and thus a new life flows in, as it were, upon it from all sides and perennial youth is unceasingly brought back to the most ancient form of human knowledge.

J. HOGAN.

Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

THE NAME OF JOHN IN HAGIOGRAPHY.

THERE is probably no other English name so popular as that of John. The same may be said of its equivalents in other tongues, Johann, Jean, Juan, Jan, João, Giovanni, Ivan, Efan, with such varieties as Jones and Hans, all of which trace their origin to the Hebrew *Jehochanan* (Yohanan). It has, like most of the Jewish proper names, a religious signification, and literally means *God has been kind.* The Greek translators of the Old Testament were not consistent in their rendering of this name from the ancient text, sometimes reading *Johanan* Ἰωανάν (I Par. iii, 15), again *Jona* Ἰωνά (IV Kings, xxv, 23), or Ἰωνάθαν (I Par. xxvi, 3), and Ἰωανῆς (II Par. xviii, 12). In the later books of the Old Law the reading Joannes Ἰωάννης is usually observed which is also adopted in the Latin Vulgate. There are at least sixteen persons of this name who figure in the sacred history of the Hebrews (in Paral., Kings, Esdras and the Macchabees), although in some cases it is not clear whether those mentioned by different writers are not identical.[1]

But it is as a Christian name that the Hebrew expression "through grace of God" has become a universal shibboleth attesting the sense of gratitude for the bestowal of the Christian religion first announced and sealed with the martyr's blood by the Precursor.

St. John the Baptist before his birth had caught the blessed influence of the Messiah's presence and communicated it to Elizabeth in the joy she felt at the salutation of Mary. And sweetly has the echo of another voice, that of St. John the Beloved, carried the joy of the Saviour's Gospel to the ends of the earth. Surely in these two shadows of the Master's figure, one before, the other after the noon-day of the Redemption, "Jehovah has been gracious."

If the name is common among Christians, we need not be surprised to find that of all others in the history of the Catholic Church it is the one that suggests the ripest fruit of Christian sanctity. The number of persons who, under

1 Ex. gr. II. Mac., xi, 17.

this name, have been placed on the calendar of the saints, or who are mentioned as canonized, beatified or venerated in different churches and religious orders, amounts to upwards of a thousand. From the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, the hagiography of the Abbé Migne, the various authenticated *Menologies* we gather the history in detail of about one hundred and eighty *canonized* saints; nearly one hundred more bear the appellation of *Beatus;* the remainder are called *Venerabilis*, which means that their claim to the process of beatification and canonization has been recognized by the Church, and a large number belong to the host of confessors of the faith whose title to the honor of heroic sanctity is established either by the fact of martyrdom or by an immemorial tradition such as gives stability to a cult that cannot be placed to any mere credulity or superstition. Stadler, in his Heiligen-Lexicon, mentions under the name of *Johannes* no less than nine hundred and ninety-four persons of whom he found some account in the various authenticated calendars of saints, and at the end, referring to the *Menologium* of the Franciscan Order, composed by Hueber, adds: "This menology contains accounts of more than a hundred other holy Franciscans who had the name of John, but we selected only such as are found in the Bollandists."

It may be asked: Is there anything peculiar in the character of these saints which shows the impress of the model whose name they bear? That this should be the case cannot surprise us when we remember that the Christian name usually given in baptism is intended to point out the patron whom the young Christian is to regard as his protector and model of life. It is of the very essence of Christian asceticism—which may be summed up in the words: Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect—that it should aim at imitating some pattern of heroic holiness; Christ in the first place, but not excluding His heroic followers, men found in similar conditions of life with ourselves and lacking the halo of the divinity.

The two great heroes who first appear in Christian history bearing the name of John, became, of course, the principal

patrons of the valiant host that followed in the train of the "Lamb." The devotion of the Christian people to the two holy contemporaries of our Lord flows in twin streams of enthusiastic attachment along the ages, now swelling the train of the Baptist, now that of the Beloved Disciple in ever fervid progress. Christian art, especially of the Middle Ages, loves to introduce the Baptist into the symbolic composition of its master-paintings, because he was regarded as the model of the monastic life, which, having lost for a time the ardor of the early Benedictines, began to flourish anew with the movement which had urged on the Crusades. Moreover, St. John was commonly chosen by the guilds as the special patron of the arts, so that a devotion to him naturally inspired the monumental works of painting, sculpture and architecture which were raised to the honor of the Most High.

The Virgin Disciple of Christ, St. John the Evangelist, had made his first acquaintance with the Master, whom he so ardently loved, through St. John the Baptist. They had stood at the well in Bethania when Jesus walked by. Then the Precurser pointed Him out, saying: "Behold the Lamb of God." And John and Andrew followed Jesus. (St. John i, 35–37). Apart from the sweet attachment to our divine Lord and His holy Mother, we may regard St. John as in a special sense the teacher and trainer of the episcopate. His Gospel, as all his writings, differs from the synoptic Gospels in this, that its doctrine enters more closely into the divine relations of Christ and His Church. On this account he has been called "Theologian," and the Greek Church still honors him under the title of θεολόγος. When, after the death of our blessed Lady, he left Jerusalem to assume the direction of the metropolitan See of Ephesus (Iren. Adv. Haeres, iii, 1), he devoted his attention to the education in the sacred office of the episcopate of such holy men as Papias of Hieropolis, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, and others. Banished to Patmos, he is shown in a vision the future of the Church, and under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, full of solicitude for the episcopate, he is moved to

write to the bishops of the seven churches. What consoling words of infallible assurance are those addressed to the poor persecuted Bishop of Smyrna and to him of Philadelphia "who had kept the word of patience!" What awful warning to the shepherd of Pergamus against whom—despite his firm faith in the Lord—he has this, that he has suffered in the midst of his flock, "them that hold the doctrine of Balaam," and are "a stumbling block before the children." So, too, he speaks to the Bishop Thyatira, whose works and faith and charity and ministry and patience he knows full well, yet against whom he charges, that he suffers a woman, Jezabel, "to seduce my servants." But there is only woe in the flaming words with which he denounces the lukewarm Bishop of Laodicea, whom, approved of before the world and blind to his own failings, he addresses as "wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked." This is the discipline of the meek Apostle whose doctrine, after he returned to Ephesus, to the end of his old age was summed up in the oft-repeated admonition: Little children love one another.

In the long catalogue of saints who follow these two models, the number of those who chose preferably to the life of activity in the world that of monastic retirement, and who in most cases shared the blessed prerogative of martyrdom, seems to be the greater. The remainder are nearly all bishops; one only canonized representative in the apostolic line of sovereign pontiffs.

The name of John is known and favored, as has been remarked, in every land of the earth; so also does the host of saints who have borne it include natives of all the regions of earth where Christian truth has found an echo.

One of the earliest anchorites, St. John "the Obedient," as he is called, comes to us from Æthiopia during the time of the Emperor Theodosius. His feast is celebrated in the Roman Martyrology on March 27.[1] Several others are cited under the title of "Æthiopian" and "Ægyptian." A number

1 The Kopts celebrate his feast on October 17, which is supposed to have been the day of his death. *Migne* and others give St. Johannes Sijutensis, who is assumed to be identical with the above, on November 17.

of native Chinese martyrs, among whom we note the learned young priest John Dat (October 28, 1798), and the layman John Baptist Con (November 7) who suffered martyrdom in Tonking toward the end of 1840, contribute to swell the list of saints who bear the significant name of John. Japan, too, is not behind its Mongoloid sister-kingdom. For February 3 the Bollandists assign five Sts. John, among whom are three who died as martyrs in Nangasaki—St. Johannes Soan, S. J., a youth of nineteen and a native of Japan ; St. Johannes Rimoia, a Japanese silk-weaver who belonged to the Third Order of St. Francis, and St. Johannes Franciscus, O.S.F., who was crucified with the other two in 1597, and canonized in 1862. In many cases the nationality of the saint is marked by the addition, to the baptismal name of an adjective indicating the birthplace, by which they are known to the Catholic world. Thus we have a Johannes *Cappadox* (February 21), a *Damascenus* (May 6), an *Hispanus* (June 25), *Germanus* (October 24), *Scotus* (November 3), a Scotch bishop and martyr of the eleventh century who is to be distinguished from the Blessed John *Scotus Malmesburiensis*, an Irishman (November 10), whose appellation *Erigena* is said to indicate his true birthplace, even if it were not known that the name *Scotus* and *Hibernicus*, or *Erin-gena*, are used indiscriminately to designate the same country. In England we have St. John of *York* (Beverlacensis), St. John of *Bridlington* (Branglanator ?). Blessed John Fisher (Roffensis) might here be mentioned with the glorious band of martyrs recently beatified, who fell victims to the so-called Reformation under Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Among these the honored name of John is most conspicuous. Besides the Blessed Cardinal Fisher, we have the beatified martyrs John Houghton, John Rochester, John Davy (Carthusians); John Forest, O.S.F.; John Stone, O.S.A.; John Haile and John Larke (secular priests); John Nelson, John Payne, John Shert, likewise priests; John Story, Doctor of Law, and Blessed John Felton, also a layman.

In a similar way we might mention a hundred others, well known by the appellation of their origin or principal scene

of activity, such as Johannes *de Manntha, Nepomucenus, Parmensis, a Facundo, Coloniensis, Cassianus, Laudensis, Trevir, Capistranus, Venetus, Salernitanus, Ruysbrochius, Avila, Prandotha* (Poland), *Dukla* (Lithuania), etc.

With many the family name of the saint has prevailed in the Christian memory. The oldest example is probably St. John *Marcus*, mentioned in the Acts xii, 12; others are St. John Francis *Regis, Gualbertus, Sarcander* (Greek translation of *Fleischmann*), *Berchmanus, de Rossi, Perboyre*, etc.

There are not many saints John of the secular clergy, but among them are to be mentioned St. John (18 Aug.) the companion of St. Crispus of very early date (Emp. Diocletian,) and St. John of Kenty (Cantius) (20 Oct.) whose admirable lessons of life as professor in theology and likewise as parish priest make him a great favorite among the clergy, especially of his own country. His peaceful character and careful conduct are imaged in the words which he wrote on the wall of his room, and which recall to mind the similar motto found over the table in the chamber of St. Augustine:

> Conturbare cave, non est placare suave;
> Diffamare cave, nam revocare grave.

Among the titles which distinguish the many saints of the name of John there are some that point to the peculiarity of their ascetical character, others to some remarkable supernatural gift or grace with which they were endowed, others again indicate the particular state or occupation in life, or the prevailing disposition of mind and heart, or even some physical condition by which they were known to their contemporaries. There is St. John the *Anchorite* (Anachoreta); the *Faster* (Jejunator); the *Almoner* (Eleemosynarius); the *Silent* (Silentiarius) whom Christian art represents as a bishop holding his finger upon his lips, (May 13); the *Humble*; the *Mendicant*; the *Ascetic* (March 16); there is another saint of the same name usually called the *Younger Ascetic* (Asceta junior) whose feast occurs on Febr. 5; *a Cruce; de Deo*; etc. Then there is the Blessed John, called the *Angelic* because of his lovely disposition (Jan. 13), St. John the *Lamb* (Agnus),

Bishop of Utrecht. Another, the Blessed Joannes Grande of the Benedictine order, persisted in calling himself the *Sinner* until people accepted the term and called the man whom they revered as a saint "Peccador," (July 3). St. John the *Good*; the *Golden-tongued* (Chrysostomos); the *Wonder-worker* (Thaumaturgos) are familiar to all. Less known, probably, are St. John the *Dwarf* (Κολοβός) one of the principal Fathers of the Desert classed among the saints in the Greek and Coptic churches;[1] St. John the *Soldier* (June 12); St. John the *Shepherd* (Opilio) whose feast is placed together with that of his holy patron, the Baptist, (June 24), because the day of his death is not certainly known. St. John, Count of Corsano, commonly known as the *Reaper* (Theristes) on acount of a miracle wrought by his intercession whilst attending the harvest laborers, is assigned in the Martyrology to June 24; but the Bollandists give his life under Febr. 24. St. John of the *Nettle* takes his name from a place overgrown with the weed, wherein he took refuge from the world and afterwards built a hospice for pilgrims who came that way from Compostella, (June 2); St. John *in the Well* (in Puteo) derives his name from having dwelt in an abandoned old cistern. The learned profession is represented by such saints as John the *Scholastic* and another *Ex-Scholastic*, patriarch of Constantinople (Feb. 21) in which latter case the word *Scholasticus* is to be taken as equivalent to *causidicus* or *advocatus* signifying that the bishop had at one time been a lawyer and renounced that profession to defend the cause of Christ. The more pretentious name Theologus, first applied to St. John the Evangelist, seems to have been given to other saints of the same name. Blessed John the Parish-priest (Plebanus), a Venetian, is celebrated Aug. 9. Among the Russian saints there is one St. John Petschiuricus, *i. e.*, the Locker (Clausor) which seems however to have here the figurative sense of "recluse." St. John *Climacus* has his name from a book which he composed with the title of "Climax" intending it to be a "Ladder" or guide to Paradise. The

1 His name is not found in the Roman Martyrology, but the Bollandists treat his life exhaustively under 17 Oct.

oddest name is one given a holy man, John Tientialbene, that is "*John stick to the good*," because he always repeated that phrase "Tien-ti-al-bene," which is the Italian for a less euphonious English phrase employed to urge us on to perseverance. His feast day occurs on the same day with Blessed John of Avelino (June 11). The word "stick" suggests another John called *a Baculo* whose feast falls on March 29.[1]

It would be a lengthy task to speak in detail of these and many other saints of the name John whom we must pass by altogether. In conclusion we merely call attention to the fact that there is a number of saints who have retained the diminutive form of the name, equivalent to our Johnny. Such as *Johannulus* (Apr. 28), *Johannillus* (May 29), *Johannicius* (Nov. 4), *Johannitius* (Aug. 1), or as another writes himself *Johannetus* (March 24), and *Johanninus* (Apr. 11). There is also a *Janbon* (Oct. 22), *Janibonus* for Joannes Bonus, and another of the same name whose feast occurs on Jan. 10.

H. J. HEUSER.

1 The Bollandists only mention his name III, 88, n. 3 on the 22 April, where they say that, as they did not have his life in time to insert it in its proper place, they shall bring it in the Supplement.

CONFERENCES.

CAN WE USE THE FORM OF INFANT BAPTISM FOR ADULTS?

Qu. The question whether the *Ordo baptismi parvulorum* may be licitly used in the baptism of adults was recently discussed by several priests from two different dioceses. Neither of the parties claimed knowledge of the existence of a special indult in their respective dioceses, such as seems to be required by the Holy See when, in answer to the petition of the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore wherein they asked for an extension of the privilege previously granted for a period of twenty years, the S. Congregation replied: "Porro S. Congregatio censuit episcopos recurrere debere, expleto tempore postremae concessionis." (Cf. Plen. Conc. Balt. II, n. 243, annot. 3.) The argument offered in favor of using the privilege, formerly accorded our Bishops, was that the shorter rite is *sanctioned by custom;* on the other hand it was said that such custom is an abuse.

Will you kindly answer this much debated and very practical query?

Resp. If custom could sanction the use of a rite, granted under exceptional conditions, but against which there exists in ordinary circumstances defined liturgical law, the argument in favor of the shorter form might have some weight. As it is, the form to be used in the administration of the sacraments being prescribed by definite rubric "Nihil aliud concessum intelligendum est, nisi illud, quod est speciatim expressum; neque ex indulto uno alterove privilegio trahi potest consequentia ad alia quae singillatim descripta non fuerint." (S. R. C. 27 Aug., 1822.) There are numerous decisions of the Holy See which annul all customs against positive rubrical prescriptions of the *Ritual*, *Missal*, *Breviary*,

Pontifical and *Episcopal Ceremonial* and against the *authentic Decrees* interpreting these prescriptions.[1]

The following decisions will show the application of this rule to cases like the one in question. The Vicar Apostolic of Corea asked:

"Licitum sit mihi in posterum absque scrupulo dare Baptismum adultis, utendo, propter defectum temporis et nimiam defatigationem, caeremoniis pro pueris assignatis, sive sint pauci, sive multi."

The answer was terse and unequivocal: *Stet Rituali Romano.* (S. C. S. Off. 12 Feb., 1851.)

A similar case is that of the Vicar Apostolic of Tonquin who stated that there existed a *custom* among the missionaries in China to use the shorter form of infant baptism for adults, and he pleaded not only the excessively hard work of the priests in these missions, but also the wish to have uniformity of practice introduced in a matter of such importance. The Propaganda replied that the Roman Ritual was to be strictly followed, *except in case of necessity.*

Some years later the matter was urged again and the Holy See then issued an indult explicitly sanctioning the custom for the Tonquin Missions under certain conditions. We give the words of the Holy See:

S. C. de Prop. Fide Ex Aud. SSi. 30 Jan., 1803.

SSmus instante Vic. Apost. Tunk. Occid. Apostolica auctoritate ac indulgentia declavarit servari posse consuetudinem, quam in Tunkino vigere expositum est, utendi in baptizandis adultis caeremoniis pro infantium Baptismate praescriptis, ubi id rationabilis necessitas, vel temporis angustia ad caeteras sacri ministerii functiones explendas, seu nimia missionariorum defatigatio exigat.

The above replies plainly show that the S. Congregation does not consider the custom of using the short form of Baptism prescribed in the Ritual for Infants as legitimate unless it have the *express* sanction of the Holy See. In the case of the Fathers of the Council who asked that the privi-

1 "Quaecumque inveterata consuetudo in centrarium derogare nequit legi a Decretis S. R. C. prescriptae." (S. R. C. 13 Aug. 1839.)

lege, previously granted for the space of twenty years, be extended without limitation in future or at least for another twenty years,[1] the Holy See answered that the Bishops would have to have recourse to Rome for an extension of the faculty at the expiration of the previous grant. We make no further comment. Each Bishop knows whether he has received the faculty, directly or indirectly, and *if he do not give explicit faculty to his clergy they cannot make use of the short form without violation of the Ritual prescription*, no matter how custom has it.

That we are rightly interpreting the sense of the reply given by the Holy See is further apparent from the action of the Propaganda in answer to the petition of our Bishops in the First Provincial Council of Baltimore. The plea given in 1829 for requesting the privilege of using the short form of Infant Baptism for Adults was (apart from the usual practice) the want of missionaries and their want of time—"Missionariorum inopia et temporis augustiis in quibus Missionarii versantur, ut ceteris sacri Ministerii officiis fungi possint." The S. Congregation answered the request by granting it for twenty years.[2] When, in 1852 the Fathers of the Plenary Council of Baltimore asked the extension of this privilege for the reason that the former difficulties were still in existence, the S. Congregation answered that the Holy See would allow it for *five* years and that, in the meantime, *the Bishops should endeavor to bring about gradually the observance of the rite of adult baptism* as prescribed in the Roman Ritual. — "Precibus istis relatis ab Emo ac Rmo. D. Raphaele Fornani in generali S. Congregationis conventu habitu die 30 Aug., 1852, Emi Patres censuerunt supplicandum SSo pro indulti prorogatione ad

1 "Quoniam gravissimae rationes a Patribus Concilii Primi Baltimorensis Provincialis allatae . . . adhuc vigent, immo in dies graviores evasurae videntur, statuunt Patres SS. supplicandum esse, ut privilegium tunc ad viginti annos juxta Patrum preces concessum, nunc perpetuum fiat vel saltem ad viginti annos iterum concedatur." Conc. Balt. Plen. II, n. 243, adn. 2.

2 Decret. 16 Oct., 1830.

quinquennium, atque *ita ut interim Episcopi paulatim ad observantiam ritus bescripti pro adultorum baptismate in Rituali Romano accedere satagant.*"[1]

The wisdom of such a restriction in the use of a privilege granted principally by reason of necessity, *i. e.*, want of time to perform the proper and prescribed functions, under ordinary circumstances, must be apparent when we regard the great difference to-day of local missionary conditions in parts of the United States. In probably the great majority of our dioceses the plea of lack of time to perform the ceremonial of adult baptism cannot be conscientiously urged as in former times, and where the necessity for using the shorter ceremony actually exists everybody knows that the Bishop can easily and quickly obtain the faculty and let his clergy know the fact of their having a right to use it.

THE NAME OF THE ANGEL IN THE INCENSE PRAYER.

Qu. Blessing the incense after the Offertory in solemn Mass the Celebrant prays: "*Per intercessionem beati Michaelis Archangeli stantis a dextris altaris incensi, etc.*" Some maintain that this should be *Per intercessionem beati Gabrielis* and refer to De Herdt's "Praxis Liturgica" (Vol. II, n. 77) which seems to favor this opinion, although the author cites a decree of the S. Congregation forbidding any change. If, as he says, the oldest Missals had actually *Gabrielis*, and the word *Michaelis* was introduced by an error of the transcribers, it seems to me that the S. Congregation would not have sanctioned it simply because it had custom in its favor, nor would the editors of the revised Missals under Pius V, Clement VIII and Urban VIII have failed to correct the error as they did in other instances.

Resp. De Herdt's opinion rests upon the conjecture of Tommasi and Merati who judged that the passage makes allusion to St. Gabriel because the words "stantis a dextris

1 Cf. Concil. Plenar. totius Americae Sept. Foed., Baltimori habitum anno 1852; p. 157.

altaris incensi" are expressly referred to him in St. Luke I, 11-19. But this reasoning is not conclusive, as the learned Cistercian, Robert Sala, in his notes to Cardinal Bona's *Res Liturgicae* points out. The above words are, it is true, used by St. Luke in speaking of the Archangel Gabriel; yet they are equally applicable to St. Michael, who like Gabriel, is "one of the seven spirits standing before the throne of God offering to Him the prayers of the Saints," which St. John in the Apocalypse (viii, 3) expresses by the symbol of incense. Moreover, the Church does distinctly apply these words to St. Michael in one of her ancient Offices, the *Apparitio S. Michaelis Arch.*, (8 May.) where the passage "stetit angelus juxta aram templi, habens thuribulum aureum in manu sua" occurs repeatedly, suggesting that the scriptural phrase of St. Luke has been here adopted because of its equal appropriateness to St. Michael.

Nor is it true that the early Missals had the word *Gabrielis* where we have *Michaelis*. Some indeed, and among them one of the oldest codices in the Augustinian library in Rome has this reading, but there is the Cologne Missal of 1133 and others mentioned by Le Brun, in which the reading *Michaelis*, as we have it to-day, is to be found. Whence Sala concludes, what the S. Congregation has distinctly emphasized by its "*Nihil innovandum*" (25 Sept. 1706), namely, that the name of St. Michael is properly placed there and was intended by the Church, from time immemorial, to represent no other, because St. Michael is the angel of the Holy Sacrifice, who carries the prayers of the faithful before the throne of God. For the same reason we find him mentioned in the "Confiteor" at the beginning of Mass, and in the Offertory of Requiem Masses.

Indeed, wherever "the Angel" without any special name is mentioned in the Holy Sacrifice, we may safely assume it to stand for St. Michael, who is honored in the Church from the earliest ages, as the guardian of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the particular protector of the Church militant. I have just come upon a sentence in Gihr's excellent treatise on the Mass, citing Dionysius the Carthusian, whose remark in this

connection is strikingly to the point. "S. Michael ecclesiam visitat," writes that prolific commentator of the fifteenth century, "et ante ejus altare stat, *habens thuribulum aureum*, *i. e.*, charitatem praecipuam ad fideles, per quam eorum spiritualia sacrificia colligit Deoque offert; cui dantur incensa multa, quando Ecclesia ejus suffragia petit suasque preces per manus illius Deo offerri precatur." (In Apoc. Ennar. cap. viii, art. 9).

THE ERECTION OF THE "VIA CRUCIS" AND THE WRITTEN PERMIT.

To the Editor of The American Ecclesiastical Review:

Reverend Sir:—In your issue of January last you say: "For the valid erection of the 'Via Crucis' the *written* consent of the Ordinary of the Diocese is required in each separate case." Now this is certainly so: 1. When it is a Franciscan Father who erects the Stations of the Cross in places outside the jurisdiction of his Order; 2. When the Stations are erected in virtue of a faculty derived from the Superior-General of the Franciscans; and 3. At least most probably when the priest procures his faculty direct from the Apostolic See. But is it so also when a priest, who is placed in charge of a parish by his Bishop, receives a written or printed faculty for erecting the "Via Crucis"? Must he too get a written permit from his Bishop for each separate erection within his own parish? You say the conclusion that he must do so seems unavoidable, and in proof of this you cite, in the first place, a decree of the S. Congreg. of Indulgences. That decree (sub n. 445; 21 June, 1879), allow me to point out, has reference to the case of certain priests in France who obtained the faculty from the Superior-General of the Franciscans, and is therefore not applicable to the case of our priests who receive a faculty in *scriptis* from their Bishop.

You appeal, in the second place, to the action of Leo XIII who, at the request of the Propaganda, granted a *sanatio* in cases where the erection was deemed invalid owing to the injunction of procuring the *consensus ordinarii in scriptis* in each instance not having been complied with. To this I have to say that the mere fact of the Holy Father having granted the *sanatio* is not conclusive evidence that the erection was invalid in those cases. The petitioner thought

it was; asked that the *sanatio* be granted where the erection was invalid "ob causam in precibus enunciatam *vel ob quamcumque aliam causam;*" and the Holy Father, without entering into the merits of the case, accorded the favor asked. He added at the same time, it is true, that the consent of the Ordinary should be sought in writing for each separate erection, "ad avertendum quodcumque dubium." He does not say that this must be done *sub poena nullitatis*, but simply "curent parochi" etc., which I take it, means no more than that this is the safe course in doubtful cases *cum agitur de Via Crucis erigenda.* My reasons for so construeing his words is the following statement contained in the "Instructio de Stationibus S. Viae Crucis auctoritate Min. Generalis tot. Ord. Fratrum Minorum edita et a S. Congr. Ind. approbata 1884." Wapelhorst quotes it in a footnote at page 490 of his Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae. It runs thus: "At *obtenta ab Episcopo in Scriptis facultate delegata*, et Parochi vel Superioris postulatione scripta, *non requiritur diversum instrumentum de eorum consensu.* (Instr. n. 30.)"

CANADENSIS.

Resp. The explanation offered by our learned correspondent is as ingenious as it is positive. Unfortunately for the argument there exists an equally positive and much more authoritative statement to the contrary by the S. Congregation which made the law and is therefore its highest and safest interpreter.

We may pass over what is said regarding the obligation of the Franciscan Fathers, with whose duties we are not concerned, nor of priests who obtain their faculty *direct* from the Apostolic See. The question at issue is, whether priests who receive their faculties from the Ordinary of their diocese by virtue of a general concession to Bishops of the United States of America, as well as to missionary Bishops in Canada and elsewhere, can erect the stations without a written permit from the Ordinary for each case. The clause of the faculty in question, which is pertinent here, reads: "Erigendi in locis suae diocesis in quibus *non adsint PP. Franciscales*, pium exercitium Viae Crucis . . . *addita insuper potestate hanc facultatem communicandi presbyteris sacro ministerio fungentibus.*" (Fac. Extraord. C. n. 10.)

Concerning this faculty our reverend correspondent asks: "Must a priest (who is placed in charge of a parish by his Bishop) get a written permit from his Bishop for each separate erection within his own parish? You say that the conclusion that he must do so seems unavoidable and in proof of this you cite, in the first place, a decree of the S. Congr. of Indulg. That decree (sub. n. 445; Jun. 21, 1879), allow me to point out, has reference to the case of certain priests in France who obtained the faculty from the Superior-General of the Franciscans, and is therefore *not applicable* to the case of our priests who receive a faculty *in scriptis* from their Bishop."

This is quite novel and would be assuring if it were not a mere conjecture stated in form of a fact. The decree of 1879 *is applicable* to the case of priests who receive their faculty from the Bishop. This has been decided quite recently by the same Congregation which originally made the decree, which proves that our interpretation was perfectly correct. Here are the words of the S. C. Ind. The italics are ours.

S. S. Indulg. Aug. 6, 1890. An ipsa concessio *episcopi qui ab Ap. Sede facultatem obtinuit* erigendi Stationes Viae Crucis, item scripto fieri debeat sub poena nullitatis?

R. *Affirmative:* et cf. Decretum Jun. 21, 1879.

The decree referred to in the answer is as follows:

S. C. Indulg. Jun. 21, 1879. An consensus Ordinarii in scriptis requiratur sub poena mullitatis *in singulis casibus pro unaquaque* stationum erectione; vel sufficiat ut sit generice praestitus pro erigendis stationibus in certo numero ecclesiarum vel oratoriorum, sine specifica designatione loci.

R. *Affirmative* ad primam partem; *Negative* ad secundam.

In the light of this response it would be irrelevant to discuss the extent to which the late *sanatio* may be applied.

A CASE OF "MIXED MARRIAGE."

Mary, a Catholic, is engaged to John, a Methodist. John is a widower, but had been divorced from his first wife before her death. John protests, so Mary says, that he will be eternally faithful to

Mary, but she fears that, as the Methodist Church allows divorce, and as John has been already divorced, he may one day take it into his head to get a divorce from her also. Mary states that she is willing to follow the advice of her pastor, but that, as she loves John, and has never had, and may never have again so good an offer of marriage, she wants to marry him *if it be lawful.*

1. Should the pastor apply for dispensation in such a case?

2. What guarantee, if the dispensation be applied for, should John give that he intends to bind himself indissolubly?

3. As most Protestants think divorce to be lawful, is it not necessary, in every particular case, to have some guarantee that they mean to contract indissolubly?

4. What is the best advice to be given under the circumstances?

Resp. The danger of divorce seems to us to have but little weight in this instance, at least from the practical point of view. Before stating the reason we permit ourselves a few observations on the general aspect of such cases in the pastoral care.

It is *a priori* unlawful to allow marriages of this kind without serious protest, on the ground of *mixta religio*, or if John have not been baptized, of *disparitas cultus*, the first of which constitutes an impediment which *forbids* the marriage, the last an impediment which *annuls* the marriage unless contracted with previous dispensation.

The first step, therefore, would be to point out to Mary the danger, not only of being forced to a divorce if John's affection for her should cease, but the far greater danger which is likely to jeopardize her happiness in the future by reason of a difference in feelings, views and beliefs concerning so vital an interest as religion and the eternal salvation of her soul, since domestic felicity depends, with rare exceptions, upon union of sentiment between husband and wife, and also their children, who cannot be rightly guided by parents who differ, or perhaps oppose each other, in their estimate of what is essential for the eternal welfare of their little ones.

All this should serve to dissuade her from the contemplated alliance unless there is hope that John will examine and embrace the Catholic faith. It may be well to remember that where there is a real affection between the parties it

requires often only a certain amount of courage, on the part of the girl, to tell the man that she will not marry a non-Catholic, and that if he truly loves her he will not think too little of her faith (which she holds dearer than life) to examine it carefully and conscientiously, and embrace it if he feels convinced of its truth. The priest to whom he applies for instruction has then an opportunity of showing the evil of mixed marriage and correcting his views about the faith. If John refuse this reasonable test, he gives cause to Mary to doubt that a union between them would end happily for either, or for the offspring, should such be the result of the marriage.

If, however, the attachment between them has grown to such an extent as to cause the fear that they would eventually marry despite the urgings of religion—or else, that some other equally grave evil would result from a refusal to marry them, then *prudence dictates that the dispensation be obtained.*

In this case Mary is to be instructed that, as a Catholic, she is obliged to insist upon the three usual conditions of perfect liberty in the exercise of her faith, of the Catholic education of all the children in case God so bless the marriage, and that by good example of her life and in every other legitimate way she will induce her husband to adopt the same religious convictions with her. The consent to the first *two* conditions should be obtained from John in some authentic form, so as to protect Mary against a possible change of sentiment.

Many pastors have the practice of presenting a document, containing the above conditions, drawn up in regular form which the non-Catholic party signs before witnesses. This is obviously a delicate proceeding and may give offence unless done with much tact. Hence others prefer to acquaint the parties with the conditions and obtain their *verbal* consent, but have the conditions mentioned in the regular marriage certificate which is handed to the Catholic party, and also have the consent stated in the marriage Register. In some cases the honorable character of the parties makes a written instrument altogether needless. Only personal discretion can determine which method to adopt in particular cases.

As for the guarantee against a possible divorce, it seems to us quite needless in such cases. Either the parties are happy, and then they don't want a divorce; or else they are unhappy in each other's society and in that case Mary could only be benefited by a divorce, which for her would mean simply separation from a disagreeable husband (though she could not marry again whilst he lives) who is obliged by law to support her, unless she herself gives cause and pleads for the divorce.

THE PRAYER IN THE TITULAR OFFICE OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST.

Mgr. Leo. Haid, O.S.B., Vicar Apostolic of North Carolina, some time ago requested of the S. Congregation of Rites the solution of the following doubt: "Which prayer is to be recited, at Lauds and Vespers, in the *Suffragia*, by priests attached to churches whose titular is St. John Baptist, since there are two feasts of the Saint, namely that of his nativity (June 24) and that of his martyrdom (Aug. 29)?"

The S. Congr. replied:

The prayer to be recited in the *Suffragia* is that of the Nativity of St. John Baptist with a change of the word *nativitate* into *commemoratione*.

TERTIARIES OF DIFFERENT ORDERS.

In January of last year the S. Congregation decided that a person could not be a Tertiary member of several religious Orders. Previously it had occurred that Tertiaries of one Community joined another in the hope of profiting by the privileges accorded to both. Hence the question whether the decree acted backward, and if so, how persons affiliated to two or more approved religious Orders were to act in order not to forfeit the privileges of membership in each.

The answer of the S. C. was that persons who had been affiliated to several Orders before the promulgation of the above-mentioned decree, were free to choose one of the Orders according to their devotion, and that they would be considered legitimate members of the same in future.

ANALECTA.

VARIORUM DUBIORUM SOLUTIO.

(*Ex S. R. C. 16 Jun. 1893.*)

GUANA.

Illmus ac Rmus Dnus Antonius Sebastianus Valente, hodiernus Patriarcha Indiarum Orientalium atque Archiepiscopus Goanus, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi insequentia Dubia, pro opportuna solutione subiecit, nimirum:

Dubium I. An stantes, aut genuflexi esse debeant Canonici initio Missae privatae Episcopi et ad benedictionem cum eidem Missae assistunt? Insuper in dicta assistentia an uti possint insignibus canonicalibus, an tantum superpelliceo, vel etiam rochetto, si eius privilegio fruantur?

Dubium. II.. Potestne tolerari quod in Officio Feriae IV, V et VI Maioris Hebdomadae cantus Lamentationum, Responsoriorum et Psalmi *Miserere* fiat simul cum sono organi aut aliorum instrumentorum, et quod perdurante expositione Sanctissimi Sacramenti, concinantur versiculi (mottetti) pariter cum sono organi aut aliorum instrumentorum musicalium, sive horis vespertinis Feriae V, sive de mane Feriae VI eiusdem Maioris Hebdomadae?

Dubium III. In cantu Evangelii Passionis D. N. I. C. per Maiorem Hebdomadam potestne admitti:

(*a*) usus tribi pluteorum sive legivorum et totidem librorum.

(*b*) quod cantores habeant faciem conversam ad Celebrantem?

(*c*) quod unus cantorum sit in ambone et alii duo in separato quoque altiori?

(*d*) cum Celebrans defectu ministrorum debeat esse unus ex cantoribus Evangelii Passionis, debetne se collocare a cornu Evangelii, an vero a cornu Epistolae?

Dubium IV. In aliquibus Goanae Archidioeceseos Ecclesiis celebratur festum Transitus Beatae Mariae Virginis a die 13 ad diem 14 Augusti, processionem qua defertur imago ipsius Deiparae in feretro deposita ac si demortua iaceret, ibique relinquitur usque ad primas Vesperas diei Assumptionis, tunc imago erecta sistitur ac si viva esset. Licetne huiusmodi usus cum hisce ritibus tolerare?

Dubium V. Potestne tolerari ut velo seu pallio contegatur imago D. N. I. C. in processionie Feriae VI Maioris Hebdomadae quod generatim in Goana Archidioecesi locum

obtinet quemadmodum etiam in processione super memorata Transitus B. M. V. fieri solet?

Dubium VI. Prohibendusne erit usus contegendi ramis et floribus tumulos, qui eriguntur in Ecclesiis occasione funeralium?

Dubium VII. In Seminario Racholensi quotannis celebratur cum magno pompae apparatu dies qua fit initium scholarum. Quaeritur utrum huiusmodo solemnitas praebeat sufficiens motivum celebrandi, uti fit, Missam votivam solemnem de Spiritu Sancto? Et quatenus affirmative, poteritne Ordinarius indulgere veniam, ut in perpetuum haec Missa celebretur?

Dubium VIII. Quum Ecclesia praefati Seminarii Titularem habeat S. Ignatium de Loyola, debetne eiusdem Sancti nomen commemorari in oratione "A cunctis" in Missis quae celebrantur in Oratorio interiori Seminarii, loco nominis Sancti Patroni loci?

Dubium IX. Potestne Ordinarius locorum transferre propter quodvis etiam leve motivum festivitates quoad solemnitatem extrinsecam, et permittere quod in die proprio Festi solummodo Missa diei cantetur absque alia pompa in eadem Ecclesia, ubi celebranda erit festivitas in aliam diem translata?

Dubium X. Debetne aboleri, an servari potest communis praxis existens in Archidioecesi Goana, quamvis ea sit contraria praescripto Ritualis, quod nempe in mandandis sepulturae clericis vel pueris, Parochus, loco praecedendi sequatur feretrum, saltem quando hoc defertur a cleris?

Dubium XI. Utrum Episcopo adsistente in throno Missae celebratae ab aliquo qui habeat dignitatem in Capitulo, possit hic sedere ad hymnum "Gloria" et ad "Credo" contra thronum Episcopi in sella instructa branchiis et fulcimento pro humeris?

Dubium XII. Utrum Canonicis Missam celebrantibus solemnoribus diebus, cum vel sine adsistentia Episcopi, liceat uti alba ornata fimbriis seu reticula a cingulo deorsum?

Dubium XIII. Utrum quando Ordinarius committit administrationem alicuius Parochialis Ecclesiae Sacerdoti Regulari, debeat hic sequi in celebratione Missae Kalendarium Dioecesanum an proprium Ordinis? et quatenus affirmative pro Kalendario proprio Ordinis, utrum Sacerdotes saeculares in eadem Ecclesia celebrantes debeant Dioecesanum Kalendarium sequi, etiam si id importet differentiam quoad colorem paramentorum?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti

Secretarii, omnibus mature perpensis, ita propositis dubiis rescribendum censuit, videlicet:

Ad I. Stare debent tantum ad benedictionem, et adhibeant solummodo rochettum cum superpelliceo.

Ad II. Negative quoad Lamentationes, Responsoria et Psalmum "*Miserere*," nec non ad reliquas liturgicas partes: in versiculis autem coram Sanctissimo Sacramento tolerari posse, attenta antiqua consuetudine.

Ad III. Affirmative ad 1^{am} partem: Negative ad 2 et 3: ad 4 Affirmative ad primam quaestionem, et Detur Decretum in Tridentina 14 Martii 1836 ad 4: Negative ad secundam.

Ad IV, V, VI. Tolerari posse.

Ad VII. Ad primam partem decernendum ab Episcopo: ad 2 Negative.

Ad VIII. In Oratorio privato Seminarii Racholensis, in oratione "*A cunctis*" exprimendum est nomen Sancti Titularis Ecclesiae eiusdem Seminarii.

Ad IX. Negative.

Ad X. Servetur Rituale Romanum Tit. 6, c. 3, n. 1.

Ad XI. Obstant Decreta.

Ad XII. Tolerari posse.

Ad XIII. Ad 1^{am} partem detur Decretum in Tuden. 23 Maii 1840 ad 5: ad 2^{am} partem, Dilata.

Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit. Die 16 Iunii 1893.

✠ CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*
Pro R. P. D. VINCENTIO NUSSI, *S. R. C. Secr.*
Can. IOANNES PONZI, *Subst.*

DE CONFRATERNITATE SACRAE FAMILIAE.

OFFICIUM ET MISSA S. FAMILIAE.

Decretum.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII. Consociationem a Sancta Familia, quae laetos atque uberes fructus iam in Ecclesia ferebat, per Litteras diei XIV. Iunii superioris anni eo salutari consilio approbavit, ut familiae christianae arctiori pietatis nexu Sanctae eidem Familiae devincirentur, et Iesus, Maria ac Ioseph familias sibi deditas tamquam rem propriam tuerentur ac foverent. Quo vero inter fideles cultus erga eamdem Sanctam Familiam in dies augeatur, plurimi amplissimi diversarum nationum Episcopi ipsi Sanctissimo Domino Nostro humillimis precibus supplicarunt, ut, quemadmodum iam in aliquibis locis obtinebat,

Officium et Missam in honorem Sanctae Familiae Nazarenae sibi, religiosisque Congregationibus petentibus concedere dignaretur.

Porro, quum in peculiari officio, iamdiu in quibusdam Dioecesibus adhibito, nonnulla immutare opus esset; visum fuit novum Officium et Missae schema conficere, quod reapse de speciali Apostolica Auctoritate concinnatum, et prouti in superiori exemplari prostat, per me infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefectum, una cum R. P. D. Augustino Caprara, Sanctae Fidei Promotore, diligenter revisum, a meipso Cardinali subsignata die eidem Sanctissimo Domino Nostro exhibitum fuit. Sanctitas vero Sua illud in omnibus approbare dignata est, benigneque indulsit, ut Festum ipsius Sanctae Familiae cum Officio ac Missa propriis a singulis Sacrorum Antistitibus pro Clero sibi commissae Dioceseos, atque a religiosis Congregationibus petentibus, sub ritu Duplicis maioris Dominica III. post Epiphaniam recoli valeat: simulque mandavit, ut in locis ubi huc usque Festum Sanctae Familiae celebratum est, illud praefatae Dominicae III. post Epiphaniam affigatur, novumque Officium cum Missa antiquo in posterum substituatur: servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 14 Iunii, 1893.

C. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA,
S. R. C., Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

VINCENTIUS NUSSI,
S. R. C., Secretarius.

DUBIA DE ERECTIONE CONFRATERNITATUM SACRAE FAMILIAE.

I.

RME DOMINE:

Emus Card. Parocchi, Archiconfrat. S. Familiae Praeses, per me infrascriptum propositis dubiis respondet:

I. An requiratur in singulis paroeciis erectio canonica ab Episcopo ad instar Confraternitatum proprie dictarum? *Resp. Negative;* fit per diploma quod Emus Praeses mittet.

II. An requiratur declaratio authentica, per diploma in scriptis vel alio modo ab Episcopo vel moderatore de erectione consociationis in singulis parociis? *Resp. Negative;* sed moderator servet quae in Regulis habentur (III, b).

III. An pro lucrandis Indulgentiis requiratur ut a singulis parochiis obtineatur pagina aggregationis a Card. Praeside subscripta, uti innuere videntur regulae (II, a), ad modum aggregationis Confraternitatum proprie dictarum? *Resp. Affirmative et*

ad mentem. Mens vero est, ut Episcopus, uno accepto ab Emo Praeside diplomate, reliqua ipse curabit imprimi ad normam illius, et singulis familiis consociatis tradet.

IV. An festum S. Familiae, associationis primarium, die Dominica infra Oct. Epiph., etiam iis in dioecesibus recoli debeat, in quibus ea die fit in choro solemnitas Epiphaniae? *Resp. Affirmative;* sed Episcopus aliam festivitatem seligere potest pro sua prudentia.

Romae, ex Aedibus Vicariatus, die 7 Aprilis, 1893.

RAPHAEL CHIMENTI,
Pro-Secret. CONF. S. FAM.

(Rmo Dno Kargst, Vic. gen. Dioc. Maten).

II.

Dub. I. An sufficiat ut parochus solum nomen patris vel capitis familiae in tabulas Consociationis Sacrae Familiae referat, vel singula familiae membra inscribere debeat? *Resp.* Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

Dub. II. An parochus pro inscriptione familiarum alterum sacerdotem delegare possit? *Resp.* Nil vetat quominus parochus in familiarum inscriptione sacerdotem adhibeat adjutorem.

Dub. III. An sufficiat ut familae in sociorum numerum adscisci cupientes hoc suum desiderium per litteras vel interpositas personas parocho intiment, vel omnino requiratur ut caput familiae vel eiusdem membrum quoddam coram parocho eum in finem personaliter compereat? *Resp.* Omnino decet ut caput familiae personaliter sistat apud parochum.

HYMNI IN LINGUA VERNACULA CORAM SSMO. EXPOSITO.

Dubium

Utrum liceat generaliter ut chorus musicorum, id est cantorum, coram SSmo. Sacramento solemniter exposito decantent hymnos in lingua vernacula?

Resp. S. C. S. Rit. "Posse, dummodo non agatur de hymno *Te Deum*, et aliis quibuscumque liturgicis precibus quae nonnisi latina lingua decantari debent. (Die 27 Febr., 1882. *Leavenworth.*)

BOOK REVIEW.

GESCHICHTE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES.—Culturzustaende seit Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zum Beginn des dreissigjaehrigen Krieges. VII B. Von Johannes Janssen. Ergaenzt u. herausgegeben von Ludwig Pastor. 1-12 Aufl.—Freiburg im Br.—B. Herder. 1893. (St. Louis, Mo.)

Every scholar in the field of history and religious polemics will admit the fairness of the canon which the great German historian of our day, Johannes Janssen, proposed to himself and to which he rigorously adhered to the last, in the composition of his history. He began his labor of collecting material in 1854. At that time he could hardly have foreseen what it would cost him to pursue the task he had proposed for himself and whether he might ever see the end of it even with a blessed old age. But he had mapped out his life work and determined upon doing, whatever the issue. For twenty-five years hardly anyone was aware of what was the mean- of the German professor's constant journeys and the search in the long neglected archives of every important library in Europe, and the company of intelligent and careful transcribers employed by him for the purpose of accurate copy. Then, all at once the first volume, covering a small but important period of past mediæval history, appeared. It began with the new epoch ushered in by the invention of the printer's art, and surveyed the condition of popular and higher education at the time in Germany, where the so-called Reformation planted its first seed of religious dissension. How that seed developed, fostered by the gathering corruption of princes, the liberalism in doctrine, and laxity in morals among all grades of the clergy, and the effect which this state of things produced upon the economic, the social and political sphere, are traced in clear successive delineation.

But that which gave to the whole work from its first beginning an authority carrying with it the conviction of self-evidence, was the method which the author pursued in his laborious compilation. He did not "make" history, as others had done before him; but he laid bare the facts that they might tell their own story with the unmistakeable candour of seeing and hearing witnesses. The prevailing system of writing history had been very different. The author would take a stand whence to view the past; that position would be largely determined by the side which gave him his early

light, by the convenient access to his favorite resources, by the direction of the wind-prophet. Thus a one-sided sketch was usually produced which gave the accidental reader no full view of the rear construction, the trenches or elevations which most often indicate the true capacity, the strength or weakness of a citadel. Not so with Janssen. He exposed, like the careful workmen on the present sites of ancient Greece, the cities as once they stood ; only digging away the dust and rubbish of four centuries. He hardly makes a comment even to explain the meaning of an overturned arch or a broken tablet. He simply takes the student by the hand, leads him to the place of the excavation, and bids him look down from the elevated stand of the present upon the hollow area below, where he may trace the avenues with their temples and palaces of long ago. And in the full glare of an unbiassed sunlight the spectator catches the proportions from whatever side he may view the once buried monuments. The reader of history forms his own estimate and that estimate comes nearer to the truth than any of those grand front elevations or side views which show and hide what the mind of the writer wishes to show and hide—knowing or feeling that "the world wants to be deceived." Janssen's history consists altogether of documentary evidence. His aim is to secure first the truth of facts, —thence a simple analysis will easily lead the just mind to a right judgment as to the forces which operate in their production. His object was, of course, as it must needs be in any historian who labors for truth in the Christian sense, to vindicate the Catholic Church founded by Christ and secured from defection by the indwelling, unto the end, of the Divine Spirit. And this is an important point to keep in view ; for there is a vague but general impression among apologists of the present day, that in order to shield the Church from the imputation of fallibility we must hide the defects of her children and her representatives. Such a course does much harm, by producing a weak and timid feeling open to skepticism, and a disposition to deny whatever tells against Catholics, where the evidence of facts calls for a very different line of conduct. Janssen, on the contrary, follows the history of facts, ignoring nothing, embellishing or depreciating nothing, but forcing the capable mind to reflection by the contrast of results traced link by link in their connection to the true cause of good and evil among men.

The swiftness with which the superiority and incisiveness of this method was recognized by friend and foe is amply attested in the unparalleled popularity of the work on its very first appearance in

Germany. Before the second volume could be issued, the twelfth edition, we believe, of the first volume had been exhausted. The author was not, however, to go without sharp criticism and challenge from the representative leaders of Protestant thought in the land of critical historians. The onslaught gave occasion to deepen the general conviction of Janssen's fairness by calling forth fresh evidence of fact in two supplementary volumes, a first and second "reply to critics," after which the humiliated sages of evangelical orthodoxy thought it wiser to hold their peace.

Janssen lived to see the publication of the sixth volume of his gigantic undertaking. He had found it necessary, owing to the accumulation of original material, to divide his subject, and had dwelt thus far, mainly upon the political aspect of Germany beginning with the latter end of the Middle Ages. It was his next purpose to treat with equal accuracy and impartiality the social status, covering the same period as far as the thirty years' war. This part would deal with art and popular literature, with schools and universities, culture and science in their relation to the economic, social and religious progress of the German people. In the spring of 1891 the historian took seriously sick. He expressed the presentiment that he would not be able to finish the task he had set himself on earth. But up to the second day before his death which occurred on Christmas eve of the same year, he continued to labor at the work, arranging, noting, correcting, in order to make the continuation of it possible to the friend and pupil whom he had chosen as the heir of his burden.

Ludwig Pastor, whose history of the mediæval Popes in which he followed the plan of original and impartial research suggested by his illustrious master, has made his name familiar to the student of every land as a peer by the side of Janssen in the field of historic inquiry, undertook the work committed to him, and in the present volume attests how worthy he was of that confidence.

Pastor found only a small fraction of the six hundred and thirty pages contained in the volume before us ready for the press. The rest of the existing MS. material had to be arranged and revised. The citations and references had to be verified, a task of no trivial kind, often requiring a search through many volumes of ephemeral literature in which the memory of the dead author could have quickly located them, but which were like grains in a straw-stack to any one else. In many cases the references were mere notes to indicate what particular books might be of service in furnishing

light on a given subject under discussion; this embraced a large range of recently published literature which Janssen had been hitherto unable to peruse. It needs no assurance from the painstaking editor of this seventh volume to convince the reader of the fidelity with which Pastor has carried out every suggestion so far as he knew or divined the purpose of his erudite predecessor.

Nor was the work, as originally proposed, to be accomplished by merely utilizing the material left by Janssen. He had, indeed, like any thoughtful projector of an important work, traced the outline of his history up to the year 1806, indicating the position into which the existing documents, many of which remain still unsearched, were to be grouped. It fell to the lot of Pastor to fill in the incomplete parts among which were the chapters treating of the Natural Sciences, Medicine, the study of Philosophy and Theology, Catholic and Protestant Translations of the Bible into the vernacular, Social demoralization and criminal statistics together with the prevailing system of administering justice. The last two of these topics are reserved for the eighth volume.

It would take the book critic too far to illustrate all the wealth of information here brought together. Like a living panorama the days and scenes of the sixteenth century repeat themselves before us, men speaking and acting as they then did, without varnish or adaptation. We see and hear Luther and his contemporaries. His views about everything and their views about him. Life at the Universities, Catholic and Protestant, the so-called Humanists, the study of philology and Latin, of jurisprudence, of mathematics and astronomy, the method of writing history at the time, the theories of the Paracelsites and other quacks as warring against the truly scientific systems of the day, the multiform development of polemic agitation in theology, the vernacular versions of the Scriptures and the influence of their sudden popularity upon homiletics, the Index, spread of books and newspapers—such are the principal topics treated in the spirit of perfect candor and impartiality. There is much in all this that should make us Catholics blush for the laxity of our ancestors, above all among the clergy and the Episcopate. But when you sum it up it only makes for the truth as testified to by the Catholic Church which has outlived the wrangling and weakness of her children and the attacks of her enemies. *Magna est veritas et praevalebit.* These were some of the last words pencilled by Janssen upon a slip of paper which contained suggestions for the preface of this seventh volume.

THE PRIEST IN THE PULPIT: A Manual of Homiletics and Catechetics. By Rev. I. Schuech, O.S.B. Transl. from the German by Rev. B. Luebbermann. With Preface by Most Rev. Wm. H. Elder, D.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1894.

At last we have, through the exertions of a learned Seminary professor of St. Mary's of the West, the first instalment of a well adapted work on Pastoral Theology. The author, a devout son of St. Benedict, had revised his book in nine successive editions ere he died, a very short time ago. The present translation is made from the eighth edition and comprises the first of three volumes, treating in turn of the pastoral activity in the pulpit, in the sanctuary and in the homes of the parishioners.

The present volume, mainly concerned with the priest as preacher and teacher, presents such striking features of excellence as to choice of matter and method of development, that the reviewer, in a short notice, is apt to fail in giving a just estimate of the practical value of the book.

The introductory chapter defines the scope of Pastoral Theology and its relation to other branches of ecclesiastical science; it points out the sources and helps to its practical study found especially in the Fathers of the Church and the Conciliar Enactments of various countries and times up to our own.

Next it reviews the requisite qualifications of the pastor, in the natural and supernatural order, for the right exercise of the holy ministry. The subject-matter of the three articles aptly condenses the marks of a true vocation to the priesthood and the precepts by the observance of which it is preserved and fostered.

After these preliminaries which cover some seventy pages of the volume and establish, so to speak, the point of view from which the subsequent treatise on the office of the priest as *Teacher* of his people is to be regarded, the subject of preaching is discussed under the various heads indicated in most approved works on Catholic Homiletics, and giving sound rules for the conduct of the preacher, as well as the choice, division and presentation of his matter. We do not know that anything new could be said on this subject, and the old principles rather gain than lose of their force when stated in the old analytic way. The second part of the volume, which treats of *Catechetical* Instruction, seems to us by far the most important, not only because the subject is so thoroughly and prac-

tically presented, but because it is the rule to attach much less importance to this branch of the pastoral office, than it deserves. Archbishop Elder, in his preface to the book, dwells upon this point in a way which makes the introductory pages of the volume of special worth to the clerical reader in the United States. "Most important," says his Grace, "we hold to be the instructions which our author gives on the teaching of catechism to children. . . . In these chapters on catechism it is shown how to descend to the level of the child and enable him to receive the truths into his mind, make them his own and assimilate them. A great deal of very zealous labor in teaching children fails of much of its fruit, from a want of knowing how to interest their attention, and how to convey into their minds the truths expressed by words. . . . Our author shows how to train children to apply their instructions at once to the good of their own souls. . ." And what is here said of children applies to many, perhaps the great majority, of our Catholic grown people. We have heard of a pastor who invited to his cathechism class on Sunday afternoons all the children up to the age of ninety ; in fact he insisted that, if anybody had to be left at home, it should be the school children, for whose salvation he feared but little as long as they attended the parochial school during week days. How quickly Catholics would rise to a high appreciation of their faith, and at the same time impress their unbelieving and prejudiced neighbors with the excellence of the Catholic religion, if pastors could find a way to establish in their parishes on Sunday afternoons regular catechetical instructions for the people, which by dint of being made continually interesting might become the talk and attraction of the most cultured as well as the humbler classes of our people, as was the case when Mgr. Dupanloup first took charge of the catechism classes in Paris.

There is a fine chapter on catechetical education, which, in two articles, teaches how to lead children to a *practice* of their faith and how to prepare them for the reception of the different sacraments, to which we would call special attention on account of its practical character ; the more so since the impression which P. Schuech's work is apt to leave on the reader at first is that it is somewhat technical and over-didactic. To the student such method of treatment is a necessity, and to the priest it can hardly prove a difficulty if he retain anything of the seminarian's habits of thought.

To allay the apprehensions, often very just, of those who distrust translations from foreign works as ill adapted to the circumstances

of our New World, we must add, that the translator, with judicious care, has not only eliminated from the English version such topics as have no bearing upon the missionary status of the United States, but substituted and inserted references to the decrees of our National Councils and to such commentaries upon them as Dr. Smith's *Elementa*, etc. Of course there necessarily remains something of the air of translation, but this can hardly be avoided, and we must be grateful to the Rev. Luebbermann for having made so excellent a work as the above accessible to the English reader.

INDIAN AND WHITE IN THE NORTH-WEST. By the Rev. L. B. Palladino, S.J. Helena, Montana: Published by Subscription. (Announcement.)

We depart from the ordinary custom of the book-reviewer to announce the proposed publication of a work which will prove a "find" to students of American history and to all readers who are interested in a truthful presentation of facts relating to the development of Catholic faith and education among the settlers and native Indians of the great North-west. The learned Jesuit, with whose writings on similar topics many are already familiar, has ready for publication an exhaustive work under the above-named title, to be printed at once if a sufficient number of subscribers can be found to second the undertaking. The work promises to be of great interest, not only from an historical point of view, but by reason of the multiform features of adventure and romance which naturally, and withal true, enter into the life and activity of early pioneers in such parts. To the Catholic educator the story of the tireless efforts of the Jesuits and the missionaries, with the marvelous results attained as the outcome of Christian self-sacrifice and Christian teaching, will be a new lesson, and, as Bishop Brondel writes in his preface to the book, "a surprise to the many who still consider Montana as belonging to the Wild West." Its pages will prove once more "that Christianity and civilization go hand in hand, and produce the happiest results."

It may be well to remember that the author of this work is the honored champion who defended by solid argument of facts the rights of our Catholic Indian schools, when the narrow-minded and openly anti-Catholic Government Commissioner, within the last few years, ruthlessly exercised his influence to destroy the Catholic schools by attempting to turn them over to infidel and sectarian hands.

We can entertain no doubt that our readers will aid in a decidedly good work, and benefit themselves by making this publication practicable at an early date. For this reason the *name and address* of intending subscribers must be sent at once to the Rev. L. B. Palladino, S.J., Helena, Montana. The work is to be paid for when received.

LE CANADA ECCLESIASTIQUE, Almanach-annuaire du Clergé Canadien. Publié par Cadieux et Derome, pour l'année 1894. (Huitème Année.) Montréal.

HOFFMANN'S CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, Almanac and Clergy-List. Quarterly for 1894. Containing complete reports of the Dioceses in the United States, Canada and Newfoundland, Vic. Apost. Sandwich Islands, and the Hierarchy in Germany and Austria-Hungary. Vol. 9, n. I.—Milwaukee: Hoffmann Bros. Co. 1894. Pr. 50c.

SADLIERS' CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, Almanac and Ordo for 1894. Issued Quarterly, with full official reports of all Dioceses, Vicariates, Prefectures, etc., in the United States, Canada, B. W. Indies, Ireland, England and Scotland. Sixty-second year. New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1894. Pr. $1.25.

The relative merit of the above-mentioned Church-Directories consists in their covering to an extent different ground, except in the case of Canada which enjoys the benefit of two English besides the French edition. Sadlier's reports include the British Isles, which fact probably accounts for the difference in price between it and Hoffmann's. The latter contains a really handsome geographical chart showing the position of Catholic dioceses for the United States. As to accuracy of details it may be supposed that, in such a multiplicity of varying statistics, errors will necessarily occur. Nevertheless, since the main object of these summaries is to guide those who may be in search of local references, it is important that the errors should be reduced to a minimum. Comparing the Milwaukee with the New York edition, in various parts, we find the former decidedly more accurate in tracing what might be considered important changes among the local clergy. Thus, to take only a few instances from the beginning: Sadlier's Directory indi-